This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

WIDENER
HN NFHH Q

HARVARD COLLEGE
APR 20 1888
LIBRARY.

No.

JOHN HARVEY TREAT.

Apr. 4 1866

$1.75

Vox Ecclesiæ;

OR,

THE DOCTRINE OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

ON

EPISCOPACY

AND

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION,

EMBRACING A REFUTATION OF THE WORK KNOWN AS

"GOODE ON ORDERS."

"TRUTH haunts no corners, seeks no by-ways; if thou profess it, do it openly. If thou seek it, do it fairly; he deserves not to profess truth that professes it fearfully; he deserves not to find the truth that seeks it fraudulently."—QUARLES.

"LAY down all affection and favor of parties. Judge justly of what shall be alleged. Unless thou know, thou canst not judge. Unless thou hear both sides, thou canst not know. If thou like aught, know why thou likest it."—JEWEL.

PHILADELPHIA:
SMITH, ENGLISH & CO.,
No. 23 NORTH SIXTH STREET.
NEW YORK: H. B. DURAND. BOSTON: E. P. DUTTON & CO.
1866.

~~H. 5320~~
C 6128.52.7

HARVARD COLLEGE
APR 25 1888
LIBRARY.

John Harvey Treat.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1866, by

SMITH, ENGLISH & CO.

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

STEREOTYPED BY J. FAGAN & SON. PRINTED BY SHERMAN & CO.

PREFACE.

THE following work has been written by a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the use of those who belong to that body, and in the hope of settling a controversy that has of late sprung up among them.

It is not (as might be supposed from a glance at the title-page) a treatise upon certain doctrines, but the discussion of a simple question of fact. The author has not written for the purpose of proving or apologizing for Apostolical Succession and Episcopacy. With their merits or demerits he has, at present, little or nothing to do. He merely undertakes to prove that those doctrines have always been avowed and acted upon by the Church.

Some may wonder that it should appear necessary to prove a matter so notorious; but, in this age of almost universal doubt and denial, nothing can be taken for granted or looked upon as established. The necessity has arisen—the fact has been denied, and, therefore, the proof is presented.

The author will never forget the astonishment with which he heard, for the first time, the denial just referred to. He saw at once that the person who made it was simply repeating the opinions or assertions of some other party; and, on inquiry, he learned that that party was the Rev. William Goode. To the "Essay on Orders," published by that gentleman, his friend referred him, describing it as a convincing and unanswerable production, by which it was proved, beyond all doubt, that the Church of England is not essentially or exclusively Episcopal. Within a few days a copy of the book was sent to him by a zealous layman, who was scattering it broadcast over the country, and he sat down to its perusal with peculiar eagerness.

The subject of Church Government was one to which he had given much attention, owing to circumstances which he may be excused for mentioning.

Although born, baptized and educated in the Church of England, he had been accustomed, all his life, to associate intimately with ministers and members of other denominations. To

many of these he was strongly attached. They were not only among his dearest and kindest friends, but they were also Christians, who, by their daily walk and conversation, adorned the doctrine of God their Saviour. Meeting with them continually in private life, and sharing regularly in their worship, it was but natural that he should imbibe their sentiments. They were, in general, very unfriendly to the Church, and unwilling to acknowledge that it had any genuine zeal for the truth of God or for the salvation of men.

Hearing statements to this effect made by persons in whom he had entire confidence, and knowing well that the modes of worship and of thought, which he had come to regard as inseparable from true religion, were neither used in the Church nor favored by it, he was easily led to accept those statements as substantially correct. At first, indeed, and often when harshly put, they seemed to him somewhat uncharitable; but he did not protest, for he had learned to believe that they were not unfounded. This being so, his attachment to the Communion of his fathers became little more than nominal. He could not be a hearty lover and faithful member of a Church that appeared to set greater store upon matters of order than upon vital truth. For various reasons he did not wholly abandon it; but his sympathies were with those who were called by other names, and who worshipped in separate sanctuaries. Continuing thus for years after he had come to man's estate, he was a zealous advocate for what he supposed to be "Evangelical" views. He was willing to look upon Episcopacy as an allowable system—the Bishop being no more than the Moderator of an Assemby, or the President of a Conference; but the Churchman's claim of divine right he regarded as arrogant assumption, savoring too much of Rome, while he looked upon "Apostolical Succession" as a mere figment — the last resort of a declining Church, invented for the purpose of giving it some apparent advantage over other bodies which surpassed it in spiritual life and zeal. Consequently he never hesitated to denounce as poor bigoted creatures all who said a word in behalf of such a doctrine, or who even ventured to name the sin of Schism.

When the providence of God led him to become a candidate for Holy Orders, he knew that there were very few, if any, in the Church whose opinions on the subjects above mentioned were similar to his own; but he supposed he might be allowed to conform in silence to Episcopal Government; or if even called upon to justify it, that he might do so on the ground of expediency. But some of his Non-Episcopal friends would not allow this. By one he was told, that no system of Church Government, which could not show true Scriptural warrant, ought to receive the sanction of a Christian man, and this

principle having been laid down, the question followed: "How he could possibly defend the constitution of the Church whose ministry he was about to enter." To this he had almost nothing to reply. He had always been prepared to attack what he considered extreme views or arrogant claims, but never to defend Episcopacy. And yet he was about to become an Episcopal Minister! He could be no longer blind to the awkwardness and inconsistency of such a position. He had wholly confined his reading to one side of the question, forgetting that common fairness required the other to be examined also. It was evident then that he must either make that examination, or unite himself with some other body. The latter alternative he was not prepared to accept, owing to the new aspect of the case; so he entered forthwith upon an honest study of ecclesiastical polity, and read with patience everything he could procure upon the subject; and the more he read, the more he became convinced that his long-cherished views were untenable. This was a bitter experience. Yet, still he persevered, in the hope that some one would incline the balance to the other side, or at least furnish sufficient reasons for stopping short of that conclusion, to which he felt that his investigation was leading him. He still clung to the spirit of his former belief, and hoped that he might be able to retain it with a satisfied mind and a clear conscience. But the better he became acquainted with the subject, the more readily he detected the unworthy arts resorted to by some who had treated of it. These were not always on one side; but it was painful to find that such offences were most frequent and gross on that to which he had been so strongly attached. This made him more suspicious of it, and even created a sort of prejudice against it. Could that be a just cause that needed such support? "*Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis* VERITAS *eget!*" Still being unwilling to judge the cause wholly by the conduct of its advocates, he prosecuted his search, turning away from unsupported assertions, looking for facts and honest arguments, and having no other desire or purpose than to ascertain the truth. The result was this — after a few years he found himself holding those very doctrines that he had formerly regarded with abhorrence.

Such was his position when Mr. Goode's book came into his hands, and so he entered upon its perusal with peculiar anxiety. What if it should present evidence that he had never seen, or arguments more powerful than he had already weighed! What if it should prove to be all that its enthusiastic eulogists represented! Should he yield to it and return to the opinions of his youth? To this there could be but one reply — "Let the TRUTH appear! If Mr. Goode, or any other, can present sufficient reason for it, I shall (like Chillingworth) 'despise the shame of one more

alteration, and, with both my arms and all my heart, most readily embrace it!'" But the reason was not presented—the change was not rendered necessary. In Mr. Goode he discovered not at all what he expected, but a skilled and subtle advocate, laboring in a cause "too weak to carry him, and too heavy to be carried by him." The "Essay," so far from convincing him that our Church had ever sanctioned Non-Episcopal Orders, served only to confirm him in the contrary belief. And when he saw clergymen who ought to have been able to form a more correct judgment, lauding that production as masterly and unanswerable, and other credulous persons accepting it on their recommendation, he considered it his duty to review the work and let the public see its real character.

He had nearly completed an answer to it, when ill health and the pressure of other engagements obliged him to put it aside. It lay thus, unfinished, in his desk for years, and would, probably, never have seen the light, but for events that are still fresh in the memory of the public. Certain clergymen of the Diocese of New York, adopted a course designed to change the settled practice of the Church, if not to change its whole character. They turned their backs upon all existing laws and all previous usage in connection with such matters, and openly admitted to their pulpits ministers who had not had Episcopal Ordination. Whether in the abstract this were right or wrong, is a question that does not concern us. That it was a violation of the laws, or at least of the customs of the Church, was clear to all men. Of course, an innovation so startling and so daring occasioned much excitement. The Bishop of the Diocese issued a Pastoral Letter, in which, in the kindest language and most reasonable spirit, he pointed out to those gentlemen the unlawfulness of their course. And *there*, if they had been lovers of Order and of peace, the whole matter might have rested. But however gentle the reproof or remonstrance, it was still an exercise of authority, and *that* was hard to bear. Therefore, the Reverend gentlemen rushed into print at once, and strove to give to the whole matter the air of simple controversy, on equal terms, between the Bishop and themselves. They represented him as the advocate of a narrow partisan policy, and not as their ecclesiastical superior to whom they had solemnly promised obedience, and whose duty compelled him to give them a reproof. Their "Letters," "Reviews" and "Replies to the Pastoral" have been sent everywhere throughout the country, and have served to show that some Episcopalians pay but little respect to those who are over them in the Lord; that they are not much disposed to "submit to their judgment" or to "follow with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions." Of those productions this is not the place to treat. As to their general merit, the author

will say no more than that he coincides with their friend of "The Presbyterian," who says:

"They have not logically answered the Right Reverend Horatio Potter. * * * We love the spirit and sympathize with the longings and desires for visible fellowship with other denominations of God's people, manifested by [those that claim to be] the Low Church party in the Episcopal Church. At the same time, our convictions compel us to say that their defence is insufficient, and that they have, in our judgment, logically failed."

But on the relation of those writings to the subject of the present work a few words must be said. They are based on the Essay of Mr. Goode. That gentleman's theory underlies the whole. He is their *sole* authority for the principal assertions they make, and for the [supposed] facts to which they refer. If, then, it should appear that those assertions are without foundation—that the alleged facts are not facts, how will they be regarded when their confident language is recalled to mind? The author readily acknowledges his own belief that they have erred only through putting too implicit trust in the learning or faithfulness of another person. He acquits them of all intention to pervert history or abuse authorities. But the public will ask why they adopted and undertook to defend a course which necessarily created discord, and even threatened the very existence of the Church, unless they were prepared to show that they had given the whole matter a thorough investigation, and were treating it from personal knowledge. As they are clergymen of high standing, and Doctors of Divinity, it was not unreasonable to expect that they would defend with much learning the course they had adopted in a matter so important; at all events, that they would point to original authorities, and not take their testimony *en gross* from "Goode on Orders," or any other modern compilation that may be read in an afternoon.

Sorry to see good men misled, and still more sorry to see them laboring zealously to lead others astray, the author believed it his duty to place the facts before them. He considered that he would be doing them a real service by printing his Review of Mr. Goode's Essay. At all events, he knew that he would be helping the cause of truth, and so he resolved to bring it out. But fearing that, if issued in its original form and compass, it would possess little permanent value, he modified its plan and enlarged it considerably, making it much more than a mere Review; and now he sends it forth, claiming that it is a thorough and faithful discussion of the subject which the "Essay on Orders" professed to treat.

He is not without hope that some of the parties herein referred to will read it with patience—that they will try to lay

prejudice aside and seek to arrive at an honest and just conclusion. If he has failed to discover the truth, and they correct him, he will be thankful for the service. If he has in any way tampered with truth, or sought his end by dishonorable means, he deserves to be exposed, and shall expect no quarter. But he trusts that they will not seize on a mere slip of the pen, or a typographical error, or anything that is palpably a *mistake*, and point to it in proof of ignorance or evil intent. He also expects that those, if any, who undertake to answer him, will not raise side issues, or grasp some unimportant particular and harp on that, but that they will go over the whole ground, or at least deal with the main question; and, above all, that they will not put the *assertions* of one man or the *opinions* of another against the EVIDENCE that is herein supplied.

From those whose motto is "NO STEP BACKWARD," he expects neither patient reading nor fair representation. Such persons are generally beyond the reach of reason, and resent all attempts to show them their error. In place of desiring to have their party right, they desire that it shall triumph, whether right or wrong, and a word said against it is, with them, an unpardonable sin. The author supposes that he has fallen into this condemnation, and, therefore, does not hope to escape. He expects the usual amount of censure or abuse. In a week or two he will see himself described as "an enemy to Evangelical religion," "a High Churchman," "a Puseyite," or, possibly, "a Papist." This will be a much more convenient way of answering his book than giving reason for reason, or putting fact against fact; but it will have the slight disadvantage of being wholly untrue.

The author yields to no man in his zeal for the unadulterated doctrines of the New Testament—those in defence of which the Fathers and founders of our Church laid down their lives. He yields to no man in his desire to see pure and undefiled religion spread and prosper in our Zion. But he begs the reader to remember, that to secure Evangelical truth, it is not necessary to neglect or surrender Apostolical Order. If any are so weak as to object that the doctrines here shown to be maintained in the Church appear uncharitable, and ought therefore to be left at the mercy of those who would repudiate them, he replies: those doctrines are based upon the Word of the Living God, and they are held by that which has ever been incomparably the most tolerant and comprehensive Church in Christendom.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTORY, ... 9

II.—GENERAL OBJECTIONS, . . . 25

III.—EXPLANATORY, ... 44

IV.—MR. GOODE'S INTRODUCTION, . 88

V.—THE PROPER SOURCES OF INFORMATION, ... 112

VI.—ANTE-REFORMATION DOCUMENTS, 117

VII.—THE FORMULARIES, ETC., . . 146

VIII.—LAWS AND OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS, 168

IX.—THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH, . 202

X.—SECONDARY STANDARDS, . . . 263

XI.—OPINIONS OF DIVINES, ... 271

XII.—AMERICAN DIVINES, ... 444

XIII.—LOW-CHURCH DIVINES, . . . 458

APPENDIX, ... 495

VOX ECCLESIÆ.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

EVERY society must have some peculiarity by which it is distinguished from all others. Sometimes this is sufficiently done by the very object for which it has been established; but if that object be pursued by others also, then the distinctive feature will be found in the nature of its organization or in its mode of working.

The Christian Church, that greatest and best of all societies, is not an exception to this rule. Its purpose, its creeds, its sacraments, and its constitution, mark it out and prevent its being mistaken for any other association. The same principle applies to all those bodies which claim to be branches of it. They all retain some of the fundamental truths of Christianity, and on this they base their claim. but they have all distinctive peculiarities, else they could not stand apart. As regards faith, worship, or government, each has something more or something less than the others, and that something, whatever

it is, is in every case the characteristic of the body, and a necessary condition of its separate existence.

Of these Christian societies by far the greater number have been established within the past three centuries. Many are of very recent date, being mere subdivisions or offshoots from older ones, and retaining, in addition to some primary truths, more or less of the peculiarities of the parent body. But all, however they may agree in general, have some distinctive feature stamped upon them by the circumstances under which they originated, or by the views of the men who founded them.

At the time of the Reformation, some of the leaders in that great movement were (as we believe) much more reasonable and wise than others. We refer to the English Reformers, who, desiring to correct rather than to destroy, contented themselves with removing those useless or superstitious additions by which Rome had marred the simplicity of the primitive doctrine and economy. But some of the continental divines, especially Zuingle and Calvin, looked with undiscriminating hatred upon almost everything that they found existing under the papacy; consequently theirs was not so much a "Reformation" as the destruction of an old Church and the erection of another entirely new. It is true, that in explanation of some of their proceedings they pleaded "necessity;" but there is reason to fear that some at least were influenced as much by the force of passion and prejudice. Be this as it may, however, they stopped at nothing, and in their undistinguishing zeal they sacrificed, among many human institutions, some that were positively scriptural or divine.

The most marked illustration of this was their action with reference to the sacred ministry. Heedless of the fact that Holy Scripture describes Apostles, Elders, and Deacons as ministers holding distinct offices, they abolished all but ONE of the *seven* orders they found existing in the Church of Rome.

In reference to the same matter the moderation and judgment of their English contemporaries were eminently displayed. With them the abuse of a thing was no argument against its use. The fact then that the majority of Bishops in Christendom were not Apostolic in faith and character, weighed nothing against the evidence of the divine will that the Episcopate should be found in the Church. Guided by the sacred volume and the records of primitive antiquity, they retained *not* the seven Romish orders, but the THREE which had been established by the Apostles themselves.

Thus, from the very first an essential difference as to polity existed between the Continental Churches and the English. They held to a parity, they were satisfied with one Order; it maintained a ministry of divers Orders. They were (*practically*, at least) Presbyterian. It was avowedly and practically Episcopal. With them the defence of their system, as it is now conducted, was an afterthought. But the Anglican Reformers in the first year of their freedom took the stand which their descendants occupy to-day — they declared to the world, on the authority of "Holy Scripture and Ancient authors," that the system of government which they retained had ever been, and should ever continue to be the constitution of the Church of Christ.

From this position the Church of England has never swerved. Now, as at first, it maintains Apostolical order in connection with Evangelical truth. And this is its characteristic feature. It is distinguished from Romanism chiefly by its doctrine, which is PROTESTANT, and from the Continental Reformed Churches by its constitution, which is EPISCOPAL.

This has always been well known, and until a recent period has been freely acknowledged. The Romanist has recognized us as holding principles different from or antagonistic to his. So has the Presbyterian. The one has fulminated his anathemas against what he calls our "heresy." The other has never spared his strongest language in denouncing what *he* calls our "arrogant pretensions" or "Popish exclusiveness." Indeed, if due allowance were made for the spirit in which they were conceived, the very accusations and admissions of our opponents would furnish satisfactory and unanswerable testimony to the distinctive principles of the Church, and to the consistency with which they have been maintained.*

We have said that, until a recent period, proof of this kind was not necessary, as the facts in the case were freely acknowledged by all. But within the present generation a change took place in the policy of our opponents, which has rendered it necessary to establish that which their predecessors were always most willing to grant. It was found that so long as the contest was waged with the Church as such, her members, however much they might differ on minor

* The note for this place being too long to be inserted here, it will be put as Appendix and marked A. The reader is earnestly requested to give it his attention before proceeding further, unless he is perfectly satisfied with the statement in the text.

matters, would stand unitedly and resolutely on the defence; and therefore direct assault was abandoned and stratagem employed. Knowing that among us (as among the members of every society) there is entire freedom of opinion on matters not regarded as fundamental, and that consequently there were discussions and party groupings, they set themselves to widen these little breaches, or rather to change friendly differences into open discord. They pursued a course calculated to alienate Churchmen of one class from those of another, and they hoped by thus dividing our forces to gain an easy victory. They seized upon the party names and kept them before the public. They represented the disagreement in opinion between "High Churchmen" and "Low Churchmen" as radical and irreconcilable; and, affecting to regard the latter as champions of the truth, they bestowed upon them much compliment, and constantly assured them of their approval and sympathy. In this way they hoped to make it almost impossible for the "Low Churchman" to take sides against them. As he was continually held up to public view as the worthy opponent of "High Church" doctrines and practices, and as they professed to assail those only, it would be very ungrateful and obtrusive for him to interfere! Supposing this impression to be created, the next step was *to represent the distinctive principles of the Church as the odious peculiarities of High Churchmen*, and then in that character to argue against and denounce them with as great bitterness as ever. By this ingenious scheme it was possible to wage the old warfare without a declaration of war; to praise the Church in

one paragraph and in the next to denounce and scoff at her cherished doctrines.*

It must be confessed that the stratagem was not wholly unsuccessful. To it we attribute the ran-

* "There was a time when the former class of persons [i.e. members of the 'multiplied Protestant denominations around us'] *affected* to distinguish in their *warfare upon our Church* between different classes of our Clergy: assuming that some were less strongly attached to the principles which they opposed than others, and *excepting them*, therefore, from the controversy which they were waging with these. It was said *not to be Episcopacy itself, but extreme and unjust extensions of the claims of Episcopacy* against which they contended. There seemed to be a hope indulged that the Church might be thus divided against itself, and its strength wasted in partial or mutual warfare, while one portion of the Clergy were selected as the object of assault, and a desire for peace with others was at the same time continually avowed."—(Sermon before Convention of Pennsylvania, A. D. 1844, by Stephen H. Tyng, D.D., page 16.)

As examples of the mode herein referred to, I subjoin one or two extracts, which need no comment. The first is from an Essay on Apostolical Succession, by Rev. T. Powell, Wesleyan minister:

"Perhaps some persons, especially members of the Establishment, may think the writer is attacking the Church. If by 'the Church' they will understand the principles of the Reformers, Archbishop Cranmer, Bishop Jewel, etc., on the questions here discussed, then he most unhesitatingly declares that, with some trifling exceptions, he heartily embraces them, and means to defend them; but if by 'the Church' they mean the principles of such men as Archbishop Laud and his disciples, the Oxford Tract men, Dr. Hook, etc., then he does controvert them; because he believes them to be unscriptural, *anti-protestant, exclusive, intolerant, and popish.*"

The writer, in page 21, defines the tenets thus denounced, and they are simply "Episcopacy by divine right" and the doctrine of "Apostolical Succession."

The Rev. Dr. Wood, of Andover, in his "Objections to Episcopacy," says (page 163): "Several distinguished Episcopalians, who have rejected *the peculiarities of High Churchmen*, have been mentioned in previous lectures." "It is my deliberate conviction that the *exclusive principle held by the High Church party* is more repugnant to the spirit of Christianity, and more odious in the sight of God, *than* ALL THE OTHER ERRORS which can be imputed to the Episcopal branch of the Christian Church." "And as there are some parts of the Book of Common Prayer which seem to give *too much support to the principles against which I so strongly object*, I cannot but hope that the parts referred to will be subjected to a thorough revision."!!

Rev. Albert Barnes, writing on "The Position of the Evangelical Party in the Episcopal Church," page 9: "That which has now grown up into the Evangelical party we suppose would have been suppressed by the overshadowing of the *Religion of Forms*, if it had not been *excited and kindled by the reflected influence on the Episcopal Church of the views and objects of evangelical* Christians of other denominations." "They

corous spirit of party, and the extremes to which, in consequence of their being thus pitted against each other, both "High" and "Low" Churchmen have gone. To it especially we attribute the fact that some are found in our body to-day who are ready to do the work of our opponents, to hand over to their brethren of the other party the characteristic principles of the Church as theirs of right, to denounce these principles as "popish" and "exclusive," and to declare that there never can be peace or prosperity in our Zion until they are repudiated; that is to say, that there never can be peace in the Episcopal Church until her members agree in thinking that there is no need for an Episcopal Church.

The book before us has been produced under the influence of this outside pressure. Its author may not have been conscious of it, but the fact remains. He is a specimen, on the one side, of that ultraism which the carefully fomented controversies of this generation have produced, as Hurrell Froude was, or as "Father Ignatius" is, on the other; and just as the reverend author would say of the latter, "He is not a Protestant!" we say of him, "He is not an Episcopalian!"

We beg the reader not to suppose that this is said

[the Low Churchmen] are men who would do honor to any cause, and whose life and labors would be a blessing to any communion. It is this party which have endeavored to engraft the spirit of evangelical religion on the forms of prelacy; and it is to their *holy and devoted efforts* that the result has already more than once occurred *that the Episcopal Church has been in danger of being rent in twain!*"

This, which the reverend author supposed to be highly complimentary, did not quite satisfy the "party" referred to, and so the editor of the Episcopal Recorder took him to task, and very properly stated that it was not any party, but "the Church itself which was the object of assault."

in the flippant manner in which party denunciations are sometimes uttered. The writer is not a partisan, nor does he rashly repeat the sayings of those who are. The sentence above is his deliberate judgment, formed from the evidence furnished by the gentleman himself, and on grounds which no rational man can reject. We will state them briefly.

As every society has its characteristic feature, so every individual must cordially accept the peculiarity of the society to which he belongs. If the society abandon that peculiarity it must cease to exist; if any member abandon it, he ceases, *ipso facto*, to belong to the society. It would be entirely vain, in such a case, to say, "Nay, he remains in connection with it and professes to be quite at home; therefore your judgment is wrong and uncharitable!" His conduct may be inconsistent, he may have what he considers very sufficient reasons for contenting himself in a false position, but to the society whose peculiar tenets or practices he rejects he cannot truly belong. On this principle precisely, we say that John Henry Newman was not a Protestant during the last year or two of his stay in our communion, and that John William Colenso is not a Christian, though he claims to be a Bishop in the Church of Christ.

We know the reply that Mr. Goode or his followers will make to this. They will say that the question is begged; that before judgment is passed it ought to be shown that what he rejects *is* an essential peculiarity of our system. Just so did Newman say up to the last hour of his professed Protestantism. Just so does "Father Ignatius" say to-day; just so does

Colenso. But are we to be forever proving to a few men what the whole world has always known and acknowledged? Is it really necessary, so late in the nineteenth century, to show that our Church is Christian — or Protestant — or Episcopal?

There are some who, in spite of all that has been done and written, will continue to demand proof of such things, just as the unbelieving Scribes and Pharisees persisted in asking for a sign from heaven. To such persons, when they deny that "Episcopacy by divine right" is the doctrine of our Church, we would simply say, it must have some distinctive feature. What then is it? It cannot be *nominal* Episcopacy, with real parity of Order, for that is the peculiarity of American Methodism. It cannot be the mere *expediency* Episcopacy advocated by Paley and one or two more, because these alone have supported such a theory. What then can it be, except that which we have stated? If any doubt exists upon this point it will be resolved as we proceed.

It has been stated above that the book before us is the product of that ultraism to which the discussions fomented by outside influence directly led; but its mode of publication is a no less remarkable and painful result of the same cause. Partyism is the natural enemy of judgment and moderation. Those who give themselves up to it soon forget original or common truths, in their zeal for the peculiarities of their respective factions, and, in obedience to this repelling spirit, they are hurried on to lengths which they themselves would formerly have denounced. Thus we see extremists of one sort going to Rome,

and those of the other going to Geneva.* We see Maskells and Newmans on the one side; Noels, Shimealls, and Cardens on the other. We recognize in the Romish Cardinal now in England an apostate Presbyter of the Protestant Church, who was led on step by step, yet rapidly, from his original position to one against which he had often spoken with fervent eloquence. And on the other side we recognize, to our deep grief, among those who were his zealous adversaries some who, in opposing his extravagant faith, lost almost *all* faith, and sowed broadcast over Britain the seeds of infidelity.†

The results of partyism have not been so terrible among us as yet, and God grant that they never may be; but they are bad enough. We have party journals, and party organizations; and springing from these we have "envy, hatred, malice, and all unchar-

* Sayings like this are very much disliked, because they are supposed to put Geneva and Rome on precisely the same level. (See Bishop McIlvaine's Tract on the subject.) The Author hopes that he will not be understood as holding or wishing to convey the idea that one is just as good as the other. He is not now considering the comparative merits of the systems thus respectively indicated. It is enough for him to know that both differ from and oppose the Church to which he belongs, and that to both the extremists on opposite sides do occasionally go off. The precise character or comparative merits of their landing-places we have nothing to do with, when considering simply the fact that the spirit of party drives them from the Church.

† The Author has heard and read with astonishment statements to the effect that Puseyism is responsible for the "Essays and Reviews" and all the lamentable rationalism that now has its seat at Oxford; indeed, he has heard this said in such a manner as to imply that prominent "Puseyites" have been leaders in this later movement. He is no admirer of Puseyism in any shape, but he does profess to love truth, and therefore he refers to this report for the purpose of giving it a flat contradiction, and of expressing his surprise that any Christian minister could deal so uncandidly. Those who know nothing whatever of the facts or the men may be misled by such assertions, but on no others will they impose. It is hardly possible to prove that Dr. Arnold was a Tractarian, or to deny that Jowett and Baden Powell were prominent "Evangelicals."

itableness." The High Churchman of to-day does not speak the language nor observe the customs of those whom he professes to follow. Still less is the concord between the Low Churchman of the present and his predecessor. In his zeal against all that smacks of Oxford, he forgets that there are fundamental principles which, as an Episcopalian, it is his duty to maintain. The party spirit bears him on and on, until he has lost sight of the ancient landmarks, and, while he fancies himself only in the advance-guard of the Church, he is really in the camp of the enemy. In his zeal for vital godliness he accepts principles that are simply destructive. He claims to be the successor of Wilberforce, Walker, Romaine, Faber, Venn, Wilks, and Griswold, and yet rushes into a radicalism which they would have unhesitatingly condemned.

If any one feels disposed to doubt this, let him contrast the practices and the publications of forty or fifty years ago with those of the present time. Let him contrast the writings of Bishop White, Bishop Griswold, or Bishop Daniel Wilson, with this work of Mr. Goode, which has actually been sent forth from the press of a society that calls itself Episcopal.

Against that Society the present writer would not have a word to say, if it had not so gone with the tide of partyism as to have forgotten its own principles and issued this book. To the spread of what is properly "Evangelical Knowledge" he is as friendly as any member of its Executive Committee, but he respectfully protests against the principles of Mr. Goode being set forth in that character. He con-

tends that they are not at all evangelical in the true and higher sense of the term, and that they are not "evangelical" even in the limited or party sense. The very purpose of the pamphlet should therefore, he believes, have prevented its appearing upon the catalogue of that or any other Episcopal society, even if there were no other reasons for its exclusion.

But the result of its appearing from the press, and with the imprimatur, of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, has given additional power of mischief to a production which, coming from a professed Episcopalian, was already well enough calculated to do harm. That he should make admissions, or advance principles hostile to those of his own Church, was surely bad enough; but that a Society organized among us for the spread of scriptural knowledge and the promotion of personal piety, and which, for the sake of its professed purpose, has been liberally supported by Churchmen, should employ the funds placed at its disposal in printing such a work, and should use all its influence in spreading it through the country, is infinitely worse.* It is, indeed, a

* In 1859, one of the most eloquent advocates of the Evangelical Knowledge Society said at its triennial meeting: "It is perfectly loyal to the Protestant Episcopal Church." "True loyalty to the Church consists in fealty to the Head of the Church, steadfastness in the faith of the Church, *firmness in upholding the order of the Church*, and adherence to the Liturgy of the Church;" and, speaking of the ministry in the THREE ORDERS, BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND DEACONS, "*This apostolic ministry it regards as being approved by Christ and sanctioned by the Holy Ghost!*" Nothing could be better than this, and yet in that same year the Executive Committee issued the book before us, in which it is argued that there are *not* three orders in the Church — that a Bishop is only a presbyter filling a higher office!

In contrast with the speech at the meeting above referred to was one delivered this year in Philadelphia, at the anniversary, in which the Rev. Dr. Dyer as Secretary proposed, among other objects to which the funds of the society might be applied, the perpetuation and dissemination of

lamentable proof of the power of party spirit, and it may lead to evils which its authors seem to have neither the wisdom to foresee, nor the ability to prevent.

. What they endorse will almost necessarily be accepted by all throughout the nation, who, in other matters, accept their guidance, and then when such opinions are received, irregular or revolutionary practices must follow, and the result of these must be either open schism in the Church or the rejection of offenders, or (what will be infinitely better than either, but *less willingly accepted*) the painful unlearning of errors thus carefully disseminated. Those evils have already commenced, and commenced as might have been foreseen among the members of that very "committee" which prepared the way for them by sending forth "Goode on Orders."

But although the author of the work before us ought not, while occupying a place in our ministry, to have written any such production, and although an Episcopal society ought not to have published it, it cannot be passed without notice or reply. The personal history, character, or office of a writer will often give additional interest of one sort or another to his works; but after all they must be read and weighed without regard to such considerations. A book must be judged by its own merits or demerits,

---

"standard works like Mr. Goode's unanswerable defence of the validity of non-episcopal orders." There were four Bishops and many clergymen present, yet no one objected! The inconsistency and absurdity of such a proposal will be apparent if we fancy the Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Publication recommending at one of its meetings to employ its funds in publishing Jeremy Taylor's "Episcopacy Asserted," or Percival on "Apostolical Succession!" But Presbyterians are not so inconsistent or unwise.

and not by names. So in regard to this now before us: we know its author, and consider him, on account of this book, disloyal to his own Church; yet it will not do to cast it aside, saying, "An enemy hath done this!" We may feel very well assured that he is not truly an Episcopalian, but even as a Presbyterian he must be heard. Let us then consider the book just as if the author wrote from a Manse in Galloway, and not from the Deanery of Ripon.

At its first appearance here it was received by Low Churchmen generally with such applause as we believe has not been given in this generation to any production of the kind. It was puffed and praised as if it were the greatest treatise upon Church polity ever written; and one editor of a Church paper expressed the belief that Mr. Goode was by special Providence raised up to produce it. The able and amiable Bishop of ———, in a charge to the Clergy of his Diocese, confidently repeated its assertions, and gave to its teachings the support of an official endorsement. The Episcopal Recorder has several times within the past six years spoken of it in terms of the highest praise, and the Editor of the Parish Visitor appeared to be at a loss for words to express his admiration. In his issue for July, 1859, he said:

"Goode on Orders is making not merely a strong impression; it is banishing and driving away the last doubt that hung upon some minds from the boldness and continuity of assertion that the Episcopal Church disallowed the validity of other than Episcopal orders. Mr. Goode now stands far in advance of any living writer of controversy. He is as remarkable for candor, honesty, impartiality, and profound regard for the whole truth, as for his diligence and sagacity in searching for it."

And then he goes on to say:

"Every one, from the Bishop of Exeter down, who has disputed his adequacy to the subject undertaken, has retired with dishonor from the contest."

Again, in another issue, the same paper thus challenges all who have a word to say for the constitution of the Church:

"The advocates of the unchurching dogma are now fairly called upon to go over the said argument and show wherein it is unsound or inconclusive, or else take a public and eternal farewell of said dogma."

In the same spirit it is still, by various editors and others, declared to be "conclusive" and "unanswerable," although we have seen such criticisms upon it as should have at least modified the boldness of such assertions.

Lastly, it is the *sole authority* quoted by Rev. Drs. Smith and Canfield, of New York, to justify their irregularities.

Surely, then, considering all this, the present writer cannot be accused of any undue love of controversy if he undertakes to examine the "argument" of Mr. Goode; to expose the real end he has in view, and the means by which he endeavors to attain it. In striving to do this, he will not offer his readers words in place of facts, or statements instead of proofs. The Editor of a well known Church paper says, that in the controversy upon this subject there has been

"A parrot-like repetition of certain assertions, *mere assertions* * * * that the law of the Church is positive against the recognition of all others than an episcopally ordained ministry;" "but no serious attempt has been made to attack the impregnable historical demonstration first brought forth by Goode, and since frequently repeated and confirmed."

The present writer is anxious to avoid all such censure; what follows, therefore, will be a very "serious attempt." But before engaging in it he would inform his readers that the sentence just quoted is calculated to leave a very erroneous impression, namely, that on one side only of this controversy mere statements have been put forth, without evidence. For our own part we have endeavored to find any one person who would undertake to substantiate the very numerous "parrot-like assertions" that we have seen published by the friends and disciples of Mr. Goode. By them the so-called "demonstration" and "facts" of that gentleman have been indeed "*frequently repeated*;" but so far as we know, and we have sought diligently, they have never once been "confirmed" by the addition of even a single authority. His book has been the grand quarry from which they have taken all their material, and some of them have not had the prudence even to hew and dress it that it might seem their own.

The reader will confer a favor on the writer of this review if he will keep that book at hand, and follow closely and patiently the examination to which it is subjected.

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS.

WE have several very serious objections to make against the general scope and method of Mr. Goode's work; and inasmuch as these could not be properly introduced in the detailed examination of his "arguments" and "facts," we deem it best to give them here in a group by themselves. They are as follows:

1st. The investigation has not been made in the proper manner. It is obvious that the doctrines of the Church can be established only by reference to her acknowledged standards. She is responsible for everything they contain, and not at all responsible for what they do not contain or plainly imply. Consequently *Catenas* are of no value, except as corroborative testimony. They can prove nothing against the standards, and as to *the Church's* doctrine they can prove nothing without them. But in the work before us, reliance is placed chiefly upon the *opinions of individuals*, while the formularies and other authentic sources of information are but slightly considered. The conclusion arrived at by such means could not be correct, except by chance.

But even in the mode which he has selected, Mr.

Goode does not conduct the argument clearly and fairly. It will be evident from what is subjoined, that the acknowledged laws of debate have not been regarded.

2d. The Author does not state precisely and fully the doctrine he wishes to maintain. The consequence of this is, that we are left to guess out his views — a task which is not very easy; as now, he seems to be contending for a particular theory, and again, for a very different one. Thus: his pamphlet or book is really an argument for the full validity of Presbyterian ordination, yet he never says so distinctly. That theory necessarily involves the doctrine of "Apostolical succession" (in the line of the Presbyterate); but he denounces Apostolical Succession without any reservation whatever, and suggests objections to it that would apply not merely to the Romish view, but to any other. At one time he acknowledges that Episcopacy is a "divine institution;" at another he deprecates the use of the word "divine," and speaks of Episcopacy as having "only" *apostolical* institution; thus changing his own ground, and suggesting a difference that has no existence. Even as "apostolical" he in one place speaks of it as binding, but in twenty others he quotes with, at least, tacit approval, passages declaring that it is *not* binding, but that every Church is left at liberty to adopt it or not, at pleasure. It is evident that, with looseness such as this, discussion cannot proceed agreeably, fairly, or with any prospect of ever coming to a conclusion.

3d. He does not state clearly and impartially the views of his opponents, while he frequently points

an argument or a quotation against some opinion that they do not hold. He goes even farther than this. He attributes to those who differ from him, sentiments from which they would shrink with horror. For instance. He says their theory adds another to the two only sacraments which our Lord Christ hath ordained in his Church, "by raising Episcopacy to a level with the things commanded, such as Baptism and the Lord's Supper!" And again, he says, that by the same theory, they send "down alive into the pit such men as Luther and Baxter, Brainerd and Jonathan Edwards!" *

4th. He does not furnish exact definitions or explanations of several important terms that he employs almost continually, and he occasionally uses the same term in very different senses. This necessarily creates ambiguity, and perplexes the discussion. We have instances in the words "order," "office," "divine," etc., etc. Even to the epithet "High Churchman," which is in constant use, he does not appear to attach any very definite meaning. Ex. Gra.: He intimates, that for the last two centuries the Church has been wandering from the old paths, in consequence of some very important changes made by the "Laudean party," who it is "*certain* DID *personally entertain those exclusive views*" which he undertakes to combat. To those men, he says, the term "High

* The reader will observe that the Reverend Author does not offer a particle of evidence in support of these weighty accusations. It would be interesting to know the name of the rigid Episcopalian who would fain send "down alive into the pit" men like Brainerd or Edwards. But it would be still more interesting to know how even the most "exclusive" theory of Episcopacy could lead to the perdition of men like Luther and Baxter, who were duly ordained by Bishops in the line of the Apostolical Succession!!

Churchman" was originally applied; and to them, and those who agree with them on the point debated, he professes to restrict it. But, on page 44, he tells his readers that, "*even the highest among our eminent High Church divines* (as they are called) *have* NEVER *advocated the extreme notions* maintained by the Tractarians, and *therefore were not High Churchmen!*" This is certainly not a very logical conclusion from all the premises, nor a very favorable specimen of clearness and consistency.

5th. He does not allow the reader to form an unbiassed opinion from the facts and arguments as he himself presents them. They are preceded by an "Introduction," in which the *petitio principii*, and the *argumentum ad hominem* are used in a manner that is totally indefensible. The question to be decided depends in a great degree upon another, namely: Whether the Church holds to the divine right of Episcopacy and the necessity for Apostolical Succession. But before entering upon the discussion he *asserts* that those doctrines are *not* taught by the Church; that they were unknown for at least a century after the Reformation, and have ever since been repudiated by our most eminent divines! But this is not all. He describes them as being "Anti-Evangelical;" as having a tendency to drive men away from the Church; as being at variance with the spirit of Christian charity and "the facts of God's providence;" as having no foundation in Holy Scripture, and as leading to consequences so dreadful that it is simply "monstrous" in any one to teach them!

Now all these descriptions and assertions might be perfectly correct, and yet the mere use of them in

such a position would suffice of itself to imperil Mr. Goode's reputation as a candid reasoner. How much worse, then, does his employing them appear when they are, one and all, things which his opponents indignantly deny, and of which he tenders no proof. He enlists in his own behalf every principle and every prejudice that can be brought to bear upon the question, and *assumes*, as undeniable facts, the very things he has yet to prove. This attempt to preöccupy and bias the minds of his readers, makes it evident that he is unwilling to trust to his own "argument." But that is of little consequence; for if the "introduction" is believed, the rest will not be required.

6th. He does not always state facts correctly, nor quote authorities with fairness. As to the facts, we take it for granted that the reverend gentleman errs only through want of knowledge, or mistake; but when ample sources of information are within his reach, it is questionable how far such an excuse should avail, especially as regards matters that he makes the basis of argument and on which he speaks so dogmatically. As to the other point: We do Mr. Goode the justice to say, that he does not alter nor add to the words of any author he quotes. *But he does occasionally take from them.* Here let us be clearly understood. We do not require a writer, when quoting, to fill his pages with irrelevant matter because it happens to form the context of the passage he wishes to use. In every such case we prefer seeing *only* what relates directly to the subject; but we want to see *all* that does. We do not object, then, to Mr. Goode's omitting words or sentences (for in

that there is no wrong, and we shall have occasion to do it ourselves continually); but we do object to his leaving out words or sentences which have a true and proper connection with the question, and the omission of which alters the character of the passage. For example, the following quotation reads well, and would be a valuable help to an advocate of Episcopacy: "By the confession of all, even of our adversaries, the power of ordination and jurisdiction is common to ALL * * * * BISHOPS." But woe to the Episcopalian who should venture to print it so, when some sharp-eyed antagonist would ferret it out and find that it reads thus: "By the confession of all, even of our adversaries, the power of ordination and jurisdiction is common to ALL *who are set over churches, whether they be called presbyters or bishops!*" Two or three instances hardly less glaring than this, are to be found in Mr. Goode's book, and will be referred to in the next section.

But again, It is quite possible to give the *words* of a passage precisely as they are, and yet quote them very unfairly. The *sense* may be changed, either by the suggestion of one entirely different from that which the writer meant to convey, or by the withholding of necessary explanation.

There is no unfairness to which a scheming controversialist can resort with greater prospect of impunity than this, for, while it is much less likely to be detected than positive change or omission of words, it serves the same end. And if it should be discovered, and the quoter be accused of dishonesty, he can assume an air of injured innocence, and say, "What have I done amiss? have I not given the *ipsissima*

verba?" As an example of this trick, let us suppose that some advocate of ministerial succession in the Protestant Church should quote an Act of Assembly of the Scotch Kirk to this effect: "We fully acknowledge and pledge ourselves to maintain the Protestant succession." It might be received as an important admission in his favor; and yet it refers only to the succession of Protestant sovereigns on the English throne! So also, by misuse of the same word, Dr. Sacheverell himself might be triumphantly referred to as an opponent of *apostolical* succession.*

But whether effected by actual change of words or judicious trimming of quotations, or by the more ingenious *suggestio falsi* just referred to, this "abuse of authors," as the Reformers called it, is a very vile offence. So vile, indeed, that it is only with the greatest reluctance, and on full proof, we should consider any man guilty of it. We therefore trust it may appear that the writer of the essay "on Orders" has not wilfully resorted to it. He knows its baseness, and has himself condemned it strongly, saying of his Tractarian opponents, "*Their Catenas parade with unblushing effrontery the names of divines who have directly and clearly opposed their views, as of advocates in their favor.*" And yet, in an argument against Episcopacy as a divine institution, Mr. Goode has ventured to quote Hooker, Andrews, Saravia, Cosin, Bramhall, and Bingham!

7th. He does not correct palpable errors, whether of fact or of opinion, which form the staple of passages that he quotes; and thus, without openly adopt-

* See Appendix, C.

ing the sentiments of the authors he cites, he permits them to influence the minds of his readers. We grant that the question is not whether the opinions of those authors were correct, but simply what those opinions were, and consequently his course in this particular is technically or logically proper, but, *morally* considered, it is very reprehensible. The generality of his readers will take for granted that what Mr. Goode quotes without disclaimer or comment, especially if the spirit of it correspond with the spirit of his work, has his full approval, or is undeniably true; and thus the effect of such quotations is just as great as if he had made similar statements in his own name. In the case before us they have a power far beyond what would appear at first, and out of all proportion to their bearing upon the precise matter at issue. The question which Mr. Goode professes to discuss is simply whether our Church acknowledges the validity of Non-Episcopal Orders. The quotations we refer to are assertions to the effect that there was not originally, or through divine appointment, any such Order as that of Bishops. To the actual question then such passages can have but little relevance, but on the great question which lies beyond it they cannot fail to mislead an unlearned and confiding reader.

The Episcopalian holds that the Apostles appointed an Order of ministers superior to Elders, who were to ordain and supervise Elders. The Presbyterian denies this, and holds that there never was any Order but one. Mr. Goode prints various extracts, in which it is asserted that the higher Order, viz: that of Bishops, was not founded by the Apostles;

that in fact Bishop and Presbyter were the same in every respect. If then Mr. Goode is to be regarded as an Episcopalian, he has certainly been very remiss, and by his carelessness appeared willing to yield a point which by all members of his Church is regarded as sacred and fundamental. But, believing as we do that he is *not* an Episcopalian, we fear that in the course thus pursued there is something worse than carelessness.

The erroneous statements referred to are chiefly in extracts from Jerome, with or through whom the mistake originated. In his Epistle to Evagrius he says that in some respects the Presbyter is equal to the Bishop, for the latter order was not a separate and superior one at its first institution, but made so afterwards, to prevent schism and strife. This mistaken opinion (it is a mere opinion, *not testimony*) is based upon the acknowledged fact, that in the New Testament the titles "Episcopus" and "Presbyterus" are applied to ministers of the same class; a fact that proves nothing against the existence of a higher order, or the divine right of a threefold ministry. Now, wherever Mr. Goode can find this error of Jerome's quoted or referred to by an Episcopal writer, even though the latter may not endorse it, he copies that passage; and, although he has done this in at least eight instances, he never once hints that Jerome was wrong, or gives the explanation of his words which eminent churchmen have furnished. Thus he leaves the impression on his reader's mind that Episcopacy really had its origin in the weakness or ambition of man, and not in the wisdom and purpose of God.

But the unfairness is still more marked. Not only does he not explain the matter, but when his own authorities quote *from the very same sentences of Jerome* words which would effectually correct the error, so far at least as the proper powers and rights of the Bishop are concerned, *Mr. Goode actually leaves out those portions of their quotations.* He has done so more than once. A line of dots supplies the place of the words unfavorable to his theory, or they are got rid of by saying, "the author, having given Jerome's words in full, adds," etc., etc. An unsuspecting reader would regard this as perfectly allowable; but when we supply some of the words which the Reverend gentleman prefers not giving "in full," a different opinion may be formed. For instance, Jerome, wishing to show how much Presbyters are superior to Deacons, takes this mode: Presbyters are almost equal to Bishops; indeed, as regards the Ministry, they are one and the same; "for what is there which a Bishop performs that a Presbyter may not do, EXCEPT ORDINATION!" These last words, decisive as to the superior rights of the Episcopal Order, Mr. Goode has omitted in every instance!

8th. We have already referred to the fact that the Reverend gentleman does not plainly set forth his own doctrine; but we have another objection to make that bears some affinity to this. He does not avow the *object* of his work. A man may state his position and argue with logical precision, but if he says nothing of the practical results that he would expect to follow from the adoption of his views, if he makes no reference to any such matter, his readers will be inclined to think that he is not candid, and that he

seeks some end that he is either afraid or ashamed to propose openly. Mr. Goode's course in the particular already mentioned, and in this, is sufficient to show that he has no confidence in the strength or justice of his cause. As to the mere discussion, he so perplexes it by change and general indefiniteness, that it is hardly possible at times to know for what, or against what, he is contending. And as to the practical issue, he is prudently silent.

The very title of his book, as it appeared at first, afforded sufficient evidence of the former statement. It ran thus: "Does the Episcopal Church teach the *exclusive validity of* ITS OWN ORDERS?" And though this was so proposed as the subject for discussion, it was never treated of for a single moment! This title was very properly described at the time as "an absurd claptrap question, the affirmative of which was never held by any man." "Mr. Goode asks, does our Church teach the exclusive validity of *its own* orders? and replies by endeavoring to show that it does not teach the exclusive validity of *Episcopal* orders, which is a totally different issue."*

For proof of the other statement we refer to the entire book. There the reader will find no avowal of the author's real object. The end for which his work was written was not merely to establish an historical fact, or determine a speculative question; it had a practical purpose, and to further that it has been circulated zealously and quoted triumphantly,

* In consequence of the criticism above quoted, the publishers changed the title, but that does not weaken the force of our objection. Either the author did not know that while his title-page stated one question, his book discussed another, or else he made the discrepancy for the purpose of embarrassing the argument.

and yet that purpose is never once hinted at in the book. He labors to prove that, as the English Church, at the time of the Reformation, gave some measure of countenance to the Protestant Churches on the Continent, its so doing amounted to a positive acknowledgment of their completeness as Churches, and their perfect equality with herself. Few would hope to gain, and few would be willing to grant, so large a conclusion from such premises; but Mr. Goode and his disciples are not satisfied even with that. What they desire is, not the confession that the Continental Reformed Churches deserved the allegiance of the Germans and Swiss three hundred years ago, nor even that they deserve it still, and that we ought to regard them with courteous sympathy; but that we should here, at our own doors, recognize fully any and every sect that calls itself a Church, and that we should cordially receive every man as a truly ordained Clergyman who claims to be so regarded, no matter how or by whom he may have been admitted to the ministry. The predecessors of those for whom the reverend gentleman is laboring were not the divines of Zurich, Geneva, Wittemburg, or Scotland, but the disorderly and factious sectaries of England; and the amount of sympathy or fraternal acknowledgment which *they* or *their* "Churches" received from our Reformers and their successors he does not venture to state. The Anglo-Saxon dissenters, whose cause he is really pleading, he does not even once refer to, but puts forward in their stead those others whose circumstances were entirely different.

9th. He does not keep to the question. This

would indeed be a difficult matter considering that there is so much uncertainty as to what the question is. But he takes a range in seeking for evidence which not even his own indefiniteness of statement can justify. There appears to be a purpose in this —the same purpose that we find everywhere in the work. Whether they bear upon the actual subject of debate or not, he prints such passages in the writings of our divines as to any extent appear, or may be made to appear unfavorable to Episcopacy. He undertakes to show that the Church *acknowledges the validity of non-episcopal ordination*, and in order to do this he quotes

I. Any passage he can find in an Anglican divine, stating that our Lord did not himself in person institute Episcopacy—which is an open question, but one that in no wise affects the point at issue.

II. Any passage in which it is confessed that Episcopacy is "not necessary to salvation"—a fact that no Churchman will deny.

III. Any passage stating that there is not set down in Holy Scripture any one form of "outward government or discipline" perfect and complete in all its details, and designed to be in every particular perpetually maintained in the Church—a confession that even a "Puseyite" would readily make, since not even one of that class would expect to find in the New Testament a perfect form of polity and discipline suited for all people and all places in all time. The Holy Book certainly teaches nothing about the special duties of Churchwardens, Archdeacons, or Deans, nor would any Churchman consider it sinful to abolish those offices.

IV. Any passage like those already alluded to in which a doubt is expressed, or an assertion made as to the essential "parity" or identity of the Orders of Bishop and Presbyter — these quotations only create confusion. They give no support whatever to the writer's cause; for even if we should grant, or he could prove "parity of Order" with essential difference in office, he would be as far as ever from his end, since in the Church's view it appertaineth exclusively to the office of a Bishop to ordain.

V. Any passage in which it is said or intimated that Episcopacy can only be *inferred* from Scripture, and from this it is argued that it cannot be binding upon Christians — which reasoning would remove the obligation of Female Communion, Infant Baptism, and the observance of the Lord's day.

VI. Any passage stating plainly that Episcopacy is nothing more than a human invention, the offspring of ambition, or expediency—which testimony, as he quotes it, would go to prove that *the Church's doctrine* is, that she herself has been for over three hundred years a sort of impostor claiming to have scriptural warrant which she has not!

Now let the reader pause for a moment and consider what quotations of these various classes have to do with the question *whether the Church recognizes Presbyterian orders as valid.* They are wholly irrelevant, and not only so, but from their general character they are calculated to cast discredit upon the Episcopal order. A fair reasoner, and especially an Episcopalian, would therefore omit them, but Mr. Goode prints and argues from them!

But the Reverend gentleman gives us also

VII. Passages in which some English divines put guards upon the formal enunciation of their doctrine, or state the exceptions that might be made, as for instance, in case of "extreme necessity"—these guards, modifications, or exceptions are quoted as if they were the fixed doctrine held by the writer.

VIII. Lastly, he furnishes passages in which there is some civil or friendly allusion to the foreign Reformed Churches, or some justification of them on the score of necessity — and these extracts are used to prove that *the Church holds* that all who imitate their form of government deserve the same measure of courtesy and kindness, and *are fully justified in doing without Bishops, though they plead no necessity whatever.*

From this analysis of his mode of reasoning, it will be seen that Mr. Goode does not deal with the question in that open, honest, manly way that shows a real confidence in the cause maintained or that wins respect even if it fail to convince the judgment. On the contrary, there is a love for ambiguity; a twisting about of words; a straining of arguments and authorities; a reticence upon some points of consequence, and an undue resting upon others; a practical avoidance of the question as stated by himself, and a still more complete avoidance of the real issue that lies behind it—which all combine to stamp the work as that of a special pleader. It could not be otherwise; with a mind so full of an extreme theory it would be impossible to conduct an impartial search for the Church's doctrine. The Essay is simply an attempt to justify the virtually Presbyterian views

adopted by Mr. Goode, and to make the Church's teaching conform to them. Of course failure was inevitable. The circle has never been squared. That or the reconciling of things essentially opposed is a task too great even for the ingenuity and persevering diligence of the Reverend author.

Before leaving this general review of his work, we must say a word or two upon a matter of taste and prudence. Charges of ignorance are freely preferred against those who have heretofore engaged in controversy upon the present topic with Mr. Goode. Such a thing, however it might do in the columns of papers friendly to the author, comes with very bad taste indeed from the Editor of his book; but far worse is it when the Reverend gentleman allows himself to speak in this manner of his adversaries. He says of them "deliberately," yea, even of the "very heads of the party" that they are "very ill-informed individuals."

We question the propriety of such accusations; they partake of the character of slander. They can be preferred by any one. They can wound feelings, or injure reputation even where there is not a particle of foundation for the charge. Therefore a man of fine feeling would not rashly employ them. If his opponent be really an ignorant pretender, such a man would rather *prove* his ignorance than proclaim it.

But we cannot see how anything is to be gained in the end by such accusations. If made on insufficient grounds, they may be credited for a time, but sooner or later the truth overtakes them, and they bring upon their author the odium he sought to fasten upon his antagonist. If the evidence be furnished,

the denunciations, or charges, might as well be omitted. If it be not furnished, they are worthless. What then are these? Do we not require something more than the mere dictum of Mr. Goode, or his American Editor, to convince us that the Bishop of Exeter, Chancellor Harrington, Archdeacon Churton, the Rev. T. K. Arnold, and others, are ignorant men. Their extensive and varied learning has always been freely acknowledged, even by those who doubt or deny their orthodoxy. If this general judgment is to be reversed, we would like to know on what grounds; but without condescending to inform us, without giving even one illustration of their supposed deficiency, Mr. Goode, in marked violation of good taste and fairness, assures his readers that they are "exceedingly ill-informed!"

Still worse, however, are his positive charges of falsehood, etc., etc. If a controversialist violates truth, or practises arts that are or seem to be dishonest, and we are satisfied that he does this wilfully, we do not expect his opponent to treat him with studious courtesy. On the contrary, in such a case we think it right to call a spade a spade, and expose the trickster so that he may be excluded from the lists of honorable disputation. It is only, however, with great reluctance we should come to such a conclusion. We are bound to exercise that charity, "which hopeth all things." But if the proofs are too many and too strong to be resisted, if there is no room left for reasonable doubt, we hold that we are then fully warranted in condemning him, and in making his guilt known. Yet we are never justified in even insinuating such a charge, unless we give

along with it the facts upon which it is based. Mr. Goode has not done this. He has offered no evidence whatever, although he says of his adversaries that their course is marked by "unblushing effrontery," "unbridled arrogance," "duplicity," and "frequent disregard of truth." The latter charge he repeats, saying, they resort to "*all sorts of inconsistencies and offences against truth!*"

It might be supposed that language so strong, and judgments so harsh as these, were hastily produced, struck out, as it were, in the heat of conflict, but we are sorry to say they have not even this in their favor. Several of them occur in a chapter, headed "MORALITY OF TRACTARIANISM," and are reprinted here from another work written years before. Being thus coolly reproduced, and without any evidence to support them, they are wholly inexcusable.

But further: we question the *prudence* of making such charges. They are so easily retorted that no one should venture upon them who is not unusually exact and circumspect. Our author is not so. He has left himself very open to just such attacks. So much so, indeed, that it is hard to believe that he has not earned them. We would not dream of calling Mr. Goode an ignorant man, either as to general scholarship, or the special subjects he undertakes to discuss, but yet he forces us, at times, to believe that he is not acquainted with facts, or writers, that he professes to know perfectly, and which he certainly ought to know. His representations are at times so widely different from the plain truth, that in kindness to himself we must suppose him so far ignorant. He escapes more severe condemnation, only

because we charitably presume that his offences are not intentional.

The laudatory references, made in newspapers and pamphlets, to the erudition, the controversial skill, and the past triumphs of the Reverend gentleman, may be easily pardoned. They are simply the usual glorification of the party champion. Doubtless the Philistines boasted greatly of the man they sent forth to defy the armies of Israel; and why should not our radical brethren extol their own Goliath. Let them do so. It is natural that they should. But we cannot help thinking that while such eulogies may be quite allowable in the columns of a journal, *they might, without any great disadvantage, have been omitted from his own book.* His victories might have been more appropriately recorded elsewhere, while his learning and ability might have been left to assert themselves. "Good wine needs no bush."

CHAPTER III.

EXPLANATORY.

ALTHOUGH we do not write for the purpose of setting forth and defending any theory, but rather of reviewing and answering the work of another, we think it will help to make the discussion more easy and agreeable if at the outset we state what we conceive to be the Church's view of the matters in debate. Taking into consideration then its standards, its history, and the "consent of eminent divines," we deduce the following tenets:

I. That our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the Christian ministry by commissioning certain chosen persons called "Apostles" to preach and to baptize all nations in his name, and to do all things needful for the full establishment of his Church, and that he promised to be with them even to the end of the world.

II. That the extent of this commission and promise implies that the ministry should continue to the end of time, and consist of those who should receive a share of the authority originally given to the Apostles, and transmitted from them in regular succession.

III. That the ministry as instituted by them, in direct accordance with the will of our Lord,

and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, consists of THREE ORDERS [that of the Bishop, the Presbyter, and the Deacon], to each of which belong special duties and privileges.

IV. That the ministry thus divinely instituted is not left in the power of man to be changed, or to be abolished, either in whole or in part, and that any wilful departure from its Order as thus constituted, or any material interference with the rights of any member thereof, is an offence against God.

V. That to ministers of the highest order [that is to Bishops], and to them alone belongs the right to ordain other ministers of the Church.

These principles contain nothing more than we ordinarily express in the two terms, Episcopacy and Apostolic Succession.

EPISCOPACY, not as an expedient, or a system of man's devising, but as possessing *divine right.*

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION as held by the primitive Church; freed from Romish additions and perversions, and made consonant with sound reason and Holy Scripture. Of this we shall treat more fully further on.

As to Episcopacy — it is not easy to ascertain the precise opinion of Mr. Goode. If we were to judge from page vii of his "Introduction," we might suppose that he regards it as "binding upon all;" but on page 93, and in other places, the aim of his argument is to destroy the idea that it is "necessary." This is the opinion that prevails throughout the book.

As to Apostolical Succession — he scouts it alto-

gether, forgetting that it involves the whole theory of a divinely commissioned ministry.

On these two points, then, we differ from the Reverend gentleman; our present business, however, is not to prove his doctrine wrong, but to show that it is not what our Church holds, and has held from the beginning.

Divine Right. — When we claim this for any institution we mean simply that it has been appointed by divine authority, and that it therefore challenges the obedience of all men. Any system that can be shown to have been divinely established with a view to continuance, has this *jus divinum;* all others, however excellent, are but human institutions, and cannot claim to be received and obeyed by all.

Taking advantage of distinctions drawn for sake of preciseness by certain eminent casuists, Mr. Goode insinuates that those things only can be said to have this divine right which were "ordained by Christ himself," or else founded on a precise command of God. The former notion would tend to prove that the larger half of the New Testament contains nothing that is binding upon us. The other would deprive of all their authority things which even the admirers of our author must regard as having most certain warrant.

Everything that the Lord God ordains *for* man is obligatory upon man. It matters not how His will has been manifested if the fact itself be clear. God himself declared his mercy to our first parents, and instructed them in the service which he would be pleased to accept. Yet the worship of the Primeval or Patriarchal Church had no higher sanction or

authority than that of the Hebrews, which was established through the instrumentality of Moses. And is St. Paul, St. Peter, or St. John to be regarded as so inferior * to the great lawgiver that the Christian Church has less claim upon the honor and obedience of men in general than the Levitical Church had upon Israel? Were not the Apostles also taught of God, and "called of God as was Aaron," and were they not fully empowered to do even a greater work than that performed by Moses? Does not refusing to acknowledge as divine and obligatory that which they established in accordance with their great commission involve the opinion that it was really *their own work?* And is not this a direct ignoring of their Apostolic character and inspiration? Yet these are things upon which we all depend, for only through them do we know of a Saviour. All Christians go without scruple to the Apostles' writings to learn there fully the *faith* of the Church of Christ. Why then must we be debarred from seeking there also the *constitution* of the Church? Or on what grounds are we to be told, when it has been discovered, that we are not obliged to conform to it? And, if there are none, what show of reason is there for what is implied in our author's remark, that "our divines for the most part contend *only* for the *Apostolical* institution of Episcopacy?" Why is it required of me, on peril of my soul, to receive a creed from the Apostles if I am at liberty to reject the Church founded by them, and to which they gave that creed in charge? Will Mr. Goode answer these questions,

* See St. Matthew xi. 11.

or is he prepared to accept the absurd idea that when an Apostle was writing, he was moved by the Holy Ghost, but when preaching or organizing a Church, he was not an authorized exponent of the divine will?

We should suppose that no Christian man, treating of the deliberate, formal, official acts of the Apostles, would seek to lessen their importance, or attempt to make a distinction between "*apostolical*" and "divine" institutions; yet this distinction our author seeks to establish. In opposition to his theory we could quote a volume of opinions from even Non-Episcopalian divines, if it were necessary; but a few will serve, as well as a thousand.

Beza says [*de gradibus Ministrorum*, cap. 23]:

"If this change [to government by Bishops] proceeded from the Apostles, I would not doubt *thoroughly to ascribe it to* DIVINE *disposition*, as I do other ordinances of the Apostles."

Zanchy, in his memorable letter to Queen Elizabeth, describes things "essential," thus:

"They are either instituted of God by Moses, or delivered by Christ, who is God manifest in the flesh; or *ordained by the Holy Spirit* ACTING *and speaking in the Apostles.*"—*Zurich Letters*, Vol. II., page 350.

Richard Watson, the celebrated Methodist theologian, writing concerning the divine institution of the Christian Sabbath, says:

"Even if it were conceded that the change of the day was made by the agreement of the Apostles, without express *directions* from Christ (which is not probable); it is certain that it was not done without *express* AUTHORITY confided to them by Christ."

Robert Hall, speaking of the Apostles, says:

"He who refuses to submit to the guidance of persons thus attested and accredited, must be considered as *virtually renounc-*

ing the revelation imparted, and as the necessary consequence forfeiting his interest in its blessings."

Thomas Cartwright, the great Puritan, notwithstanding his subsequent change, may be classed among Non-Episcopalians, and he says:

"The *example of the Apostles, and general practice of the Church under them, draweth a necessity.*"

To these we add the judgment of an eminent churchman, to whom Mr. Goode will not object. The excellent Bishop Hall, of Norwich, in his "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted," maintains:

"1st. That government, whose foundation is laid by Christ, and whose fabric is raised by the Apostles, is of divine institution."

"2nd. *The practice and recommendation of the Apostles is sufficient warrant for an Apostolical institution.*"

And that by *Apostolical*, he here means *divine* will appear from what follows:

"In eminent and authorized persons even examples are rules, *much more so in sacred, neither did the Spirit of God confine itself to words, but expressed itself also in the holy actions of his inspired servants.*"

Having thus shown that in the judgment of men of various creeds, Apostolical institution is *divine* institution, we infer that even if our Lord himself did not establish Episcopacy, or at least a ministry of divers orders, the fact of its having been established by his chosen Apostles, gives it *divine right*, and so makes it binding.

Our author says this is "raising Episcopacy to a level with things positively commanded." We confess that it is. But, when he adds such things "as Baptism, and the Lord's Supper!" we protest. These are, indeed, things positively commanded, but we have always regarded them as something more.

If the Reverend gentleman thinks differently, he will probably be convinced by reading the definition of a Sacrament given in the Church Catechism.

Here then we leave this subject, for the present; in the next chapter we shall treat of the difference between "Apostolic precedent" and "Apostolic command," as insisted upon in the book before us.

Necessary. — When in this discussion we declare anything to be "necessary" or binding, we mean simply that it is required of us by the divine law; it is a thing which, because it is appointed by God, we are not left at liberty to accept or neglect at pleasure; it is a thing which, under ordinary circumstances, we cannot reject without sin. Yet it by no means follows, as Mr. Goode suggests, that such a thing must be "*absolutely* necessary." To regard Episcopacy in this light would be to raise it, not only "to the level" of the Sacraments, but far above them, for they are only "*generally* necessary." To regard it so would be to put it in a position where it must stand alone! There is no one thing *absolutely* necessary as a condition of salvation. Repentance is not, faith is not, personal holiness is not — because infants are saved without any of these. Theological knowledge or a pure belief is not — for multitudes will be saved at last whose creed was erroneous or defective, and doubtless millions will enter into bliss eternal who in life knew little of mooted points in divinity. Why then should Church order be regarded as more necessary than any or all of these? Our author would answer, "Why, indeed?" and would try to leave on the minds of his readers the impression that it *is* so considered by those who differ with him on

the general subject of his work.* But he cannot succeed. If Archdeacon Denison, or any other individual, have set forth such an opinion, on him be the responsibility. The Church teaches no such doctrine. Our author is welcome to this acknowledgment. We do not believe that a man will fail of attaining eternal life simply because he does not belong to a properly or perfectly constituted Church; but we do believe that he *ought* to belong to such a Church, and that his doing so would conduce greatly to his spiritual advantage and comfort. We hold that Episcopacy being the divinely appointed polity, any organization that rejects it, being thus deficient in structure and authority, is not a true or complete Church. We regard such rejection as schismatic and sinful; yet we have not the least hesitation in believing that our merciful Lord will pardon this as well as many other errors and defects in those who are misled.

Mr. Goode quotes with triumph various passages containing acknowledgments similar to this, but we cannot see how they are to help his cause, unless, indeed, he is able to prove that a thing which is not *absolutely* necessary is not necessary in any sense.

Apostolical Succession. — As this very name has become odious to many who judge of the doctrine by the misrepresentations of those who do not hold it,

* Page 33.—Cartwright, "like Archdeacon Denison, maintained that matters of discipline and kind of government are matters *necessary to salvation.*"

Page 44.—Episcopacy "has not been authoritatively laid down by Christ or his apostles as of *indispensible obligation*, and therefore is *not binding* upon all churches." How a system could be binding upon *some* Churches and not upon all, the author does not state.

Page 93.—"Absolute necessity."

or by the perversions and exaggerations of some who do, it is necessary to state plainly what it is, and what it is not. The doctrine of "Succession" is based upon the principle that man cannot originate a Church; that is Christ's prerogative. Man cannot, therefore, qualify his fellow man to act as a minister in Christ's Church. No one can give to another what he does not possess, therefore no layman, or number of laymen, can by any possibility give authority to minister in the Word and Sacraments, for the simple reason that they themselves have not that authority. Each and every clergyman then must receive his commission from at least one who is already in the ministry; *he* in turn from others holding the same great office, and so on back from generation to generation, until we reach those to whom Christ said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you, Go ye therefore into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." To all who are duly ordained then in this succession belong the special promise of the Lord, the right to preach his Gospel, administer his Sacraments, and exercise discipline in his Church; and these rights or powers belong to no person whatever who is not so ordained. However pious, zealous, eloquent, or learned a man may be, if he has not been regularly called and sent into the Lord's vineyard by those having lawful authority, he is not truly a minister of Christ.

The doctrine thus briefly stated is held and acted upon (with more or less strictness) by every body of Christians that believes in a regular ministry. Even those who systematically denounce, practically main-

tain it, and others who oppose it zealously have to do so in spite of their own standards. Let us take the case of the Presbyterians, in whose behalf Mr. Goode's book has been written. We will have no difficulty in showing that they, both in their teaching and practice, uphold the principle of succession. Their ministers are set apart or "ordained" by a Presbytery, or body of ministers, each one of whom has been himself previously commissioned by prayer and the imposition of hands of other presbyters, and so on back to the Reformation, at which time their peculiar system originated;* and as those who established it were (in their opinion) duly authorized ministers, the line goes back as before to the Apostles. Thus they endeavor to preserve a successive ministry, and so they recognize the theory. But they go further than this. Some ministers of that Church will grant the occasional use of their pulpits to preachers whose commission is questionable; but the denomination will not receive into their ministry any one, however good or gifted, who has not received his authority in due course from men whom they consider qualified to bestow it.

Such is their practice.† Their public teaching corresponds with it. For instance, we ourselves once heard a very eminent professor speak thus at the "ordination" of a former pupil:

"Though we utterly reject the claims advanced by Epis-

* "Zuingle asserted the rights of the people in general. *Here we see the beginning of the Presbyterian system.*" — (*D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation*, vol. iii. p. 248.)

† The writer is aware that there have been irregularities in this particular, especially in this generation, and in this country, but that fact does not weaken the statement above. Irregularities cannot be admitted as evidence against law; we reason from the rule, not from exceptions.

copalians, we are not, by any means, levellers. We have no sympathy with those who think that laymen can originate a ministry. To ordain ministers of the word is in the power of those, and *only those*, who have themselves been lawfully admitted to that holy calling."

Still more explicit are these words of a distinguished member of the same Church:

"I *believe in Apostolical Succession, through a line of presbyters.*"

To the same purpose is the following testimony from men of the highest standing in the body.

Rev. Dr. Miller, says:

"None are regularly invested with the ministerial character, or can, with propriety, be recognized in this character, but those who have been set apart to the office by persons lawfully clothed with the power of ordaining." — (*Letters on Christian Ministry*, p. 8.)

"It is only in so far as any succession flows through the line of Presbyters, that it is either regular or valid."—(*Letters, etc., etc.*, p. 347.)

Rev. Dr. McLeod, says:

"A person who is not ordained to office by a Presbytery *has no right to be received as a Minister of Christ, his administration of ordinances is invalid, no divine blessing is promised upon his labors;* it is rebellion against the head of the Church to support him in his pretensions; Christ has excluded him in his providence from admission through the ordinary door, and if he has no evidence of miraculous power to testify his extraordinary mission, he is an impostor!" — (*Ecclesiastical Catechism*, p. 30, quoted in *How's Vindication*, p. 18.)

But the best proof is to be found in their standards. Of these, the first and chief is the Confession, etc., of the Westminster Assembly; its teaching is as follows:

"No man ought to take on him the office of the Ministry, without a lawful calling."

"Ordination is always to be continued in the Church."

"Every Minister is to be ordained by imposition of hands with prayer and fasting, by those *preaching presbyters* to whom it doth belong."

By this rule even the "lay-elders," so called, are excluded from participating in this work. It is confined exclusively to those who are themselves in the Ministerial Succession. If then a party of those "lay-elders" should solemnly lay hands upon some individual, and thus, in their intention, set him apart to the work of the Ministry, no Presbyterian could acknowledge that person as rightly empowered, no Presbytery would admit him. He might be very able, very useful, or even very holy, yet he would be rejected. His right to use his gifts in the sacred office of the Gospel Ministry would be totally denied, because he had not received what they believe to be regular and valid ordination.

Here, then, is complete agreement with us, as to general doctrine, and the practice based upon it. They maintain what they regard as a true succession in the Ministry; we do the same. They refuse to accept those whom they consider improperly ordained, or not ordained at all; we do just the same. Consequently, every accusation of "uncharitableness," or "exclusiveness" preferred against us, affects them also. If we are "popish" in this matter, so are they. If, as Mr. Goode, or his Editor, believes, it is "monstrous" for Churchmen to hold the doctrine of "succession," it is surely no less monstrous for his Non-Episcopal friends to do so. They do not differ from us, to the least extent, in the general principle, nor as to the rights of those who are duly ordained, but as to the party possessing the right or power to ordain. The only question, between us and them, is, does this power belong to "preaching Presbyters," or to the Bishops of the Church?

Into the merits of this question we are not now called upon to enter. It is sufficient for our purpose to have proved that the doctrine here defined, though in these days denounced by flippant and partisan writers, is yet really held by the most important of the Non-Episcopal denominations.

It must be borne in mind, however, that as those who hold Presbyterian views of Church government, have of late years assailed this doctrine so bitterly, they are popularly regarded as having abandoned all their share in it, and so now-a-days whenever Apostolical Succession is mentioned, it is understood as meaning that which *we* hold, viz., succession in the line of the Episcopate. It is, in this sense chiefly, if not exclusively, that it will be used in the following pages:

There are views of this doctrine, or opinions closely connected with it, which had their origin in the Church of Rome, and for which we find no warrant in the standards or recognized teachings of our own. These views are always associated with an undue estimate of sacramental virtue and ministerial (or "priestly") power. They place the mere *opus operatum* of a duly commissioned Priest far above the most reverent act of devotion that could be performed by one whose authority to minister is at all questionable. On this theory, if a man be only a regularly ordained Minister in the line of the Succession, his acts necessarily confer grace; he has the power to forgive sins, and to speak authoritatively in the name of Christ, although his doctrine may be heretical, or his life abominable. We freely confess that we would find difficulty in producing

any very great number of extracts to justify this description.* Such views *substantially* prevail in the Church of Rome, and have prevailed among those Protestants who have apostatized to her; but the plain enunciation of them is not common. Yet what we find it hard to prove against a few extremists, our author does not hesitate to charge upon all holders of the true doctrine. The exaggerated or Romish theory is that the possession of the Apostolical Constitution, and a properly transmitted authority, is enough to constitute a true or perfect Church. Thus Succession is held to be *everything*, or almost everything, while by Mr. Goode and his followers, it is held to be *nothing*. Against both extremes our Church protests by her careful preser-

* Mr. Keble says the "vital and decisive" part of the doctrine of Succession is the necessity of the Apostolical commission to the "*derivation of Sacramental grace;*" and again: "The treasury of sound doctrine was to be guarded by the *grace of the Apostolical Succession.*" "*Episcopal grace is by God's ordinance the guardian of sound doctrine.*"

Dean Hook has not gone so far as some of his quondam associates, yet in the following sentences from his Sermons on the Church, he has certainly gone somewhat farther than he is warranted. "Unless Christ be spiritually present with the Ministers of religion in their services, *those services will be* VAIN." "The only ministrations to which he has promised his presence is to those of the Bishops, who are successors of the first commissioned Apostles, and the other Clergy acting under their sanction, and by their authority." This is quite true, if it mean that no official ministrations are *authorized and regular*, but those of properly ordained men, and none so likely to be fully acceptable to God, *but it is not true*, if it means that a blessing cannot accompany the devotions of persons, who are irregularly ordained, or not ordained at all. The venerable gentleman forgets that there are more promises than one. Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said: "Wherever two or three are gathered together, in my name, *there* AM I in the midst of them!"

In the preface to the 3rd and 4th Volume of "Froude's Remains," the Editor (J. H. Newman) says: "*To seek communion with Christ through any Non-Episcopal Association, is to be regarded* (not as a schism merely, but) *as an impossibility.*" This sentence justifies of itself what has been said above. Its author afterward avowed that his object was "The UNPROTESTANTIZING of the Established Church." But after such a declaration of opinion, the confession was hardly needed.

vation of "Evangelical Truth, and Apostolic Order." With her, Succession is *much*, but purity of doctrine is MORE, and *both* are necessary to constitute a Church in the true and full sense of the term.

The error as to the authority and worthiness of the individual minister is traceable in the main to that heretical doctrine of the Roman sect, which makes Holy Orders a Sacrament. As we utterly reject that doctrine, so we reject also the corollary, that the grace required for the proper discharge of the sacred office is conferred in and by the act of Ordination. In our view that solemn rite is for the conveyance of *authority*, and not of internal qualifications.

It is not a sufficient reply to this to say, that when the Bishop in ordaining lays his hands upon the candidate he says, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted," etc., etc. These words are used because it is judged best to keep as close as possible to the model set before us in Holy Writ; and inasmuch as they were employed by our Lord when appointing the Apostles to act as his ambassadors, the Church retains them in the service by which others were sent forth to carry on their work. It is not supposed (at least by any Protestant) that, in consequence of the words spoken by our Lord, the Apostles themselves had absolutely power to forgive sins, for that appertaineth to God alone. And certainly the Church which acknowledges this cannot be regarded as claiming that she can give this power to fallible men, or that her Bishop's use of the words is more efficacious than Christ's. Neither will it be contended that the Sa-

viour's saying "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," even accompanied as it was by the symbolic action of breathing on the disciples, conveyed to them all necessary qualification for their work; for he himself desired them to tarry at Jerusalem until they should be *endued with power from on high;* from which it is manifest that they were not at that time so endued. It was only when the Holy Spirit descended upon them at Pentecost that they received their tongues of fire and were replenished with those sevenfold gifts which enabled them to go forth conquering and to conquer. If then, in what may be properly regarded as the ordination of the Apostles by their divine Master, neither the acts nor the words He employed conveyed the grace necessary for the discharge of their office, no acts or words that any Bishop or other man may use can possibly convey such grace. From our Lord, as Head of the Church, the twelve received their commission; from the Holy Ghost they received their spiritual qualification.* And so must it be at all times. The Church can by her official act bestow the authority, but she cannot impart the *virtues* necessary for the proper exercise of the Christian ministry. A man can receive an ordinary and lawful commission only from Christ, through her, but the *fitness* must come from the Lord, the Spirit. †

---

* "*Ordinario Vocatio fit a Deo et per homines. Quatenus est a Deo, est interna, quatenus est per homines est externa.*"—(*Bishop Pearson, Minor Theological Works*, Vol. i., 291; *Goode on Orders*, 79.)

† To the present writer it does not seem possible to avoid the force of the common objection against the doctrine of Succession, if more is claimed in it than the transmission of authority. But when a clergyman, holding what we regard as the Church's view, is asked how he can

Every Churchman believes, indeed, that a God-fearing candidate, coming with humble and prayerful heart to his ordination, will, in answer to his own supplications and those of the Bishop, Presbyters, and people there assembled, receive a blessing, an increase of grace, strengthening his good resolutions and his faith, and comforting his heart with the assurance that he shares in the promised presence of the Lord. But very different from this is the idea that a formal, cold-hearted, professional candidate is so blessed, or that a vile hypocrite, upon whom the hands of a Bishop may be duly laid, receives the sanctifying graces of the Holy Spirit, *ex opere operato*. Such a notion is both wicked and absurd. Mere ordination works no such magical change; although it may have been canonically performed, he that was formal before is formal still, he that was unholy is unholy still.

But to return to "Succession." We would warn the reader against mistaking the meaning of the word as it occurs in quotations from the Fathers and other Christian writers up to the seventeenth century. In the first three or four centuries, when heretical teachers claimed to be exponents of the true faith, they were called upon to show their "succession." This did not mean the fact of their having been ordained in the regular line of the ministry, but a list of Bishops in any one See holding their doctrines. This is the sense in which the word was frequently,

---

value a succession that passed through the vileness of Romanism, he can very readily reply, "Why may I not receive a good commission through the hands of an unworthy predecessor?" Alexander Borgia and Hildebrand might hand down legitimate authority, but they could not possibly convey the Holy Ghost.

if not always, employed during the Reformation period. Thus Harding says to Jewel:—

"If you can prove no succession, then whereby hold you?" "*How many Bishops can you reckon whom in the church of Salisbury you have succeeded, as well in doctrine as in outward sitting in that chair?*"

To this Jewel replies, *inter alia:*—

'If it were certain that religion and the truth of God passeth evermore orderly by succession, and none otherwise, then were succession * * * * a very good argument of the truth. But Christ saith * * * By order of succession 'the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair.' Annas and Caiaphas, touching succession, were as well Bishops as Aaron and Eleazar." "Howbeit, as the Scribes and Pharisees succeeded Moses, perverting and breaking the laws of Moses, even so do the Bishops of Rome this day succeed Christ, perverting and breaking the laws of Christ."—(*Defence of Apology*, vol. ii., page 323, etc.)

Again he says:—

"*Lawful succession standeth not only in succession of places and persons*, but also and much rather in doctrine."—(Ibid., page 201.)

To the same purpose Whittaker says:—

"Though we should concede the succession of that [the Romish] Church to have been unbroken and entire, yet that would be a matter of no weight; because *we regard not the external succession of persons and places*, but the internal one of faith and doctrine."—(*Disputations on Scripture*, page 510.)

Such extracts as these are sometimes quoted in the present controversy, but they have no proper connection with it.* The *word* succession is indeed used in them, but its signification is wholly different from that which it now bears. Our Church has never valued that "succession of persons and places" to which reference is made in these quotations; but she has always required and maintained the other,

* See Gallagher's "True Churchmanship," page 36, etc. For more on this subject, refer to Appendix, C.

namely, a complete ministry, derived from the Apostles by unbroken transmission of authority. And, in connection with this, she no less positively requires and maintains succession in the Apostles' doctrine. Of these two, Rome preserves and extols the former. Protestant Non-Episcopal bodies are no less zealous for the latter. Our Church properly values and upholds both.

Necessity. — In the controversy about church polity and Orders, this word is used to signify that constraint which force of circumstances may put upon any people, obliging them to depart from settled usage or Scriptural rule.

"*Necessitas non habet legem*" was a Roman proverb, the propriety and force of which must be acknowledged by all. In reference to our present subject, one of the most eminent of the defenders of our Church uses almost the very words, viz., "*Nisi coegerit dura necessitas cui nulla lex est posita.*" (*Hadrian Saravia's Reply to Beza.*) The principle then is freely admitted. Necessity excuseth every defect or irregularity which it *really* occasions.

The plea of necessity was advanced by some of the Continental Reformers to excuse their departure from the Scriptural polity of the Church;* and

* Luther, Melancthon, and their associates say, in the memorable Augsburg Confession: "The Bishops do either force our priests to disclaim and condemn this kind of doctrine, which we have here confessed, or by a certain new and unheard of kind of cruelty put the poor and innocent souls to death. These causes are they which hinder our priests from receiving their Bishops, so as the Bishop is the cause *why that canonical government or policy which we earnestly desired to conserve is in some places now dissolved.*"

"And now here again we desire to testify to the world that we will willingly conserve the ecclesiastical and canonical government, if only the Bishops will cease to exercise cruelty upon our Churches. *This our will shall excuse us before* GOD *and before all the world unto all posterity;* that

their English brethren, who were in some respects more favorably situated, did not feel at liberty to refuse the plea, or to upbraid them on account of the deficiencies which they themselves professed to deplore. In tenderness, therefore, to their feelings, they refrained from all unnecessary allusion to the subject. Having themselves to do battle against Rome, the great enemy of all, they were rejoiced that their brethren had been emancipated from its creed and power; and they knew too well the necessity for union against a foe so mighty and so unscrupulous, to repel those who offered to aid them in the strife. If indeed no plea of necessity had been advanced, it may be well questioned whether the English Reformers could have made even so much of an alliance as they did; but since it was put forth, there could be no reasonable ground for refusal. On this account, then, the divines of the English Church did unquestionably entertain and express the most kindly feelings toward the ministers and people of the foreign Reformed Churches. But this fact proves nothing for Mr. Goode. To sympathize with the Protestants of Germany or Geneva is one thing; to acknowledge their Churches as perfect, or their ministers as validly ordained, is another. Proofs of sympathy and fraternal feeling may be produced in abundance, but *acknowledgments of validity, etc.*, will be sought in vain.

---

it may not be unjustly imputed unto us that the authority of Bishops is impaired amongst us, when men shall hear and read, that we, earnestly deprecating the unjust cruelty of the Bishops, could obtain no equal measure at their hands."—(*Confess. Augsburg*, in Symbolical books of Lutheran Church, and also in appendix to Page's edition of *Burnet on the Thirty-Nine Articles.*)

For more on this subject, see Appendix, B.

And yet, if such could be furnished, a candid reasoner would not attempt to wring from that fact an argument in favor of those who have no necessity to plead.

The course of the Continental divines, with reference to the subject before us, was by no means uniform. Some of them were very inconsistent; but the English Church was by no means called upon to notice the writings of individual men, however prominent they might be. Therefore, when some, especially of the second generation, defended that peculiarity of their system which its founders professed to lament, she did not issue any protest or anathema. They were beyond her jurisdiction; and therefore she did not feel at liberty to interfere, further than by continuing, as from the first, to bear public testimony, by her formularies and her practice, to the truth she held. Her divines did indeed, from time to time, enter the lists of discussion with the Continental asserters of Presbyterianism; but so careful was the Church to avoid all cause of complaint on the part of those who were yet weak, and by whom opposition was in any way deprecated, that even her staunchest defenders wrote only on general principles, making no direct assault upon the Churches to which their adversaries belonged. This generous consideration was not always appreciated.*

But while some of the foreign divines tried to defend and to propagate their defective and unscrip-

* Beza, who complained that Dr. Sutcliff printed an argument that touched him, did not himself scruple to interfere with the peace of the English Church, and even went so far as to recommend that the power of the sword should be used to propagate his favorite system.—(See his correspondence with Whitgift, in Strypes's Life of W., appendix.)

tural system, others of more reasonable spirit acknowledged its real character,* and some openly declared that, if such a thing were possible, they would gladly re-establish the Apostolic polity. Thus the "plea of necessity" was continued.

In addition to the ample evidence given elsewhere, that the Continental Reformers bore their testimony to the excellence and the Scriptural authority of Episcopacy, and expressed great regret at being (as they believed) obliged to do without it, we print here one or two passages, which will be sufficient to establish the statement just made.

Hierome Zanchy, writing to Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1571, says:—

"Your Majesty should rather consider and employ all your consideration, authority, and influence to this end, that you may have in the first place BISHOPS truly pious and well instructed in sacred learning, as, by the blessing of God, you already possess very many; and [you] should encourage and attend to them." "The ELDERS [or Presbyters] in like manner, and the Deacons, are to be admonished, that every one be diligent in his office." * * * * "*For these* THREE ORDERS *of men are the nerves of the Church, upon which its safety or downfall depends.*"—(*Zurich Letters*, Vol. ii., 352.)

Even Theodore Beza himself, in his letter to Archbishop Whitgift, says:—

"In my writings touching Church government I ever impugned the *Romish* Hierarchy, but never intended to touch or impugn the ecclesiastical polity of the Church of England."

Again, in his reply to Saravia, he speaks of Episcopacy as "a *singular blessing of God*, and prays that the English Church may always enjoy it!"

In nowise different from these are the sentiments of Isaac Casaubon, Fregevil, and others cited by Bishop

* See Appendix, B.

Hall, or of Peter du Moulin, Gaches of Charenton, De Le Angle, Lectures of Geneva, Dr. Du Moulin, Monsieur Bose, etc., etc., as shown by Dr. Durell, in his "View of the Foreign Reformed Churches," and quoted also in "How's Vindication," pp. 193–202.

At the Synod of Dort, [A. D., 1618–19]:

"When the Bishop of Landaff [Carleton] had, in a speech of his, touched upon Episcopal government, and showed that the want thereof gave opportunities to those divisions which were then on foot in the Netherlands, Bogermannus, the President of that Assembly, and in a good allowance of what had been spoken, said: 'Alas, my Lord, we are not so happy!' Neither did he speak this in a fashionable compliment (neither the person, nor the place, nor the hearers were fit for that), but in a sad gravity and conscionable profession of a known truth." — (*Bishop Hall's Episcopacy by Divine Right*, part 1, sec. 4.)

Bishop Carleton himself testifies that in a conference with some of the most learned divines of that Synod, they declared that they

"Had a great honor for the good order and discipline of the Church of England, and *heartily wished they could establish themselves upon this model;* but they had no prospect of such a happiness; and *since the civil government had made their desires* IMPRACTICABLE *they hoped God would be merciful to them.*" — (*Brandt's Reformation*, Vol. iii., p. 288. *Collier's Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. ii., p. 718. *How's Vindication*, p. 206.)

Those who remonstrated against the conduct and theological decisions of that Synod, did not differ from it on this point, as may be seen by the judgment of Grotius, quoted in the Appendix. Nor was there any difference in the opinion of the more moderate of their divines in later times. As for instance, Le Clerc, the eminent Presbyterian clergyman of Amsterdam, in his addition to the famous work of Grotius, says: "*Si Episcopi tunc temporis idem*," etc., etc., etc. [in preference to giving the whole passage in

Latin, we print some sentences from Clark's translation]:

"If the Bishops everywhere at that time had been willing to do of their own accord what was not long after done in England, that [the Episcopal] government had prevailed, even to this day, amongst all who separated from the Romish Church." "*For if we would judge of the matter truly there was no other reason for changing the government than this, that whilst the ancient government remained nothing could be procured, however just, in itself.* Therefore the Presbyterian form is appointed in many places, *which, after it was once done, was so much for the interest of all them who presided in the state affairs in those places, and is so at this time* (A. D, 1709] *not to have it changed, that it* MUST OF NECESSITY BE CONTINUED. Wherefore prudent men, though *they above all things wish for apostolical form of Church Government,* and that it might be everywhere alike; *yet they think things had better be left in the state in which they now are than venture the hazards that always attend the attempt of new things.*" — (*Le Clerc's Edition of Grotius de Veritat. Relig. Christ.*, reprint, 12mo., London, 1823, pp. 208, 209.

Protestations like these would, of course, have great weight with the authorities of the English Church. They caused that friendly silence to which we have referred above, and made the judgment of individual divines as gentle as even charity could demand. Thus, says the eminent Bishop Andrews in his second letter to Molinœus:

"*Quæris tum peccentne in jus divinum ecclesiæ vestræ? Non dixi. Id tantum dixi. Abesse ab ecclesiis vestris aliquid, quod de jure divino sit: culpâ autem vestrâ non abesse sed injuria temporum.*" — (*Opuscula*, London, 1629, p. 195.)

He was obliged in conscience to say that there was a great defect in their churches; but the blame he was willing to lay upon the circumstances in which they were placed.

To the same effect precisely, Dr. T. Puller, in his "Moderation of the Church of England," says:

"Although our Church hath had the peculiar happiness of

a Monarchical Reformation, and retained the blessing of Episcopal government; yet such is the moderation of our Church, she imputes the want of the same in other Reformed Churches, *not so much to any fault of those churches themselves, but rather to the injury of the times.*"—(Page 261.)

One who was towards the Church of England either a friend or a candid adversary, could not, as it seems to us, misunderstand or misrepresent this courteous forbearance. Yet it has been referred to as if it showed something more than a charitable desire to overlook irregularities that were confessed, and to avoid controversy as long as it was possible. Some persons cannot see the difference between *not denouncing* and *actually approving*, and it would appear that our author is one of them. We cannot on any other supposition account for his publishing the following as if it served his purpose. It is from Dr. Crakanthorp's *Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ:*

"We desire, indeed, from our hearts that *since that law of necessity is taken away*, all their churches would also determine *to return to that mode of ordaining, and that original order most constantly observed by the universal Church, and that they would restore to the Bishops their authority*; but this we wish, we do not *compel. We have neither right nor power over these churches*, nor *do we desire it.*"

This is precisely as if a man should say, "I wish from my heart my neighbor would do right, and be a better man; but I can only regret his course, I cannot amend it, I have no power to control him, nor do I desire it." Would any one think of quoting this as indicating a very high and especial esteem for the party spoken of? Would any fair-minded person use it to prove that the speaker acknowledged the propriety of his neighbor's course on the very points referred to?

However favorably the English Church may have regarded the foreign Protestants for the sake of the side they took on the great questions then at issue or however much she desired to maintain a friendly peace with them, she never once made any such "acknowledgment" or admission as Mr. Goode asserts: nor can her general friendliness be tortured into anything like a recognition of "the validity of their orders;" but, on the other hand, the course pursued toward their Puritan imitators shows conclusively that she did *not* admit the sufficiency of Presbyterian ordination when it had no "necessity" to excuse it, and claimed to be acknowledged on its own merits.

The whole plea of necessity has been strongly opposed by some writers of our Church on the following grounds — 1st. Certain Bishops, such as Herman, of Cologne, John Thurzo, of Breslaw, and others, were so far favorable to the Reformation that through them a valid consecration to the Episcopal office might have been attained. 2nd. But even if this were not possible there could be no just grounds for interfering with the arrangements of the universal Church, and disregarding the authority of Scripture. The salvation of men did not depend so completely upon the continuance of the ministerial office that they were warranted in violating law for the purpose of perpetuating it. If the line of ordainers had indeed been allowed to fail, that fact would excuse the absence of ordained men, but it certainly did not confer new powers on any one, and therefore would not excuse the assumption of such powers. How could any individual say that he personally was *obliged* to ordain a man, or how could any other plead

that he was *compelled* to receive ordination at the hands of a Presbytery?*

There is great force in these objections; nevertheless we think it far better to grant all that the Foreign Churches claimed in the way of necessity, inasmuch as the English Church certainly did so at the time.†

Order and **Office.**—The Apostles appointed certain persons to assist and to succeed them in the work of preaching the Gospel; and forasmuch as those persons were set apart in common for one great work, they belong so far to ONE order, that is they were all Ministers of Christ. But the Apostles did not assign to all the same duties and powers. Some had one sort of service to perform and some another, and to those of each class was given the authority necessary for the fulfilment of its proper function. The classes into which the Ministry was thus divided were THREE, and similar (as we hold) in all essential points to those now known among us as BISHOPS, PRESBYTERS, and DEACONS. If then we now-a-days speak with reference to the rank of any Minister, we say "he belongs to

---

* See Bishop Whittingham's Notes, pp. 354, 355, etc., American Edition of Palmer on the Church. Also, Bishop H. N. Onderdonk, Note E appended to his work "Episcopacy tested by Scripture." Bishop Hobart in a note to the "Collection of Essays," published in 1806, says he "had no reference to those *cases of necessity* in which some Episcopalians *think* Presbyterian ordination may be admitted.

† Bishop Hall, addressing Grahame, says of "Churches abroad," "They plead to be by a kind of necessity cast upon that condition which you have willingly chosen. *They were not,* THEY COULD NOT BE what you were and might still have been!"

Archbishop Laud says, in his Conference with Fisher, § 21, No. 3, "The [foreign] Protestants did not depart; for departure is voluntary, so was *not* theirs. I say not theirs, taking their whole body and cause together. For that some among them were peevish, and some ignorantly zealous, is neither to be doubted, nor is there danger in confessing it."

Testimony to the same effect could be given from many others, but these are sufficient.

the Order of Deacons," or "Presbyters;" while, if we are considering his work, we say his is the Office of "a Deacon," or "a Bishop," as the case may be. There could be no misunderstanding this. But the Church of Rome added four Orders to the three that were divinely appointed; and, as additional degrees were, from time to time, formed in her towering hierarchy, and new Orders could not continually be added, she had at last several *ranks* of persons belonging to *one Order!* and these were described as differing, each from the other, merely in dignity and office. Thus ambiguity arose. In the English Church [and even in our own] we have clergymen filling certain positions which have attached thereto special duties and rights; but it is not supposed by any one that these — that is to say, Archdeacons, Deans, or Presiding Bishops — are separate Orders. This is the key to the whole difficulty. While it is perfectly legitimate to speak of the sacred Office of a Bishop, or a Deacon, it would be totally wrong to say "the holy Order of Archbishops." Both words can be used for those degrees in the ministry which are of divine institution, but to them the title of "Order" is now generally restricted. If this is borne in mind all the hair-splitting of Schoolmen, and all the confusion which the Roman canonists or Mr. Goode can make, will not prevent our seeing the point at issue. Some, or indeed most of those whom he quotes as holding to parity of Order, believed also that the difference in Office which they acknowledged was of divine appointment; but Mr. Goode does not mean to represent it in this light. Whatever may have been *their* view, he uses their words to support his own,

and that is simply this — that a Bishop differs from an Elder only in so far as an Archbishop differs from other Bishops, which is just so far as, by *human* authority, he has been called to higher honor and jurisdiction; that in fact *he has no more Scriptural warrant for his peculiar position and work than an Archdeacon has for his!*

If the Diaconate be granted as a Scriptural Order, then, on this theory, there are *only* TWO ORDERS in the Christian Ministry; if it be cast aside as also a "human institution," then there is but ONE!

Contrary as this theory is to our settled belief, we confess that its advocates can make a respectable show of argument for it; but we are amazed at the hardihood of the man who undertakes to show that it is the doctrine of the Episcopal Church!

Church. — The definition of the visible Church of Christ, as given in the Nineteenth Article, is as follows: —

"A congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered in all those things that are of necessity requisite to the same."

This seems to be sufficiently clear and full, but it has not by any means put an end to controversy upon the matter. There are almost as many different opinions about the meaning of the Article as there were before about the word it defines.

One person will require, according to this explanation, that every member shall be in deed and in truth a "faithful" man; and, if this be not the case, he withdraws himself from that which he declares cannot be the Church of Christ.* Another will insist upon the

* This is almost always the plea of the Separatist.

preaching of *what he believes* to be "the pure word of God;" and if it is wanting, he unhesitatingly says, "No Church!"* While a third no less rigorously demands that *what* HE *considers* necessary to the due administration of the sacraments shall be found in it; and if not, he says, "No Church!"†

In our opinion, they are all in error. The first [or Puritan] interpretation is plainly overthrown by the Twenty-Sixth Article, which says that "in the visible Church the evil are *ever* mingled with the good, and sometimes the evil have chief authority." The second [or strict doctrinarian] view is refuted by the second paragraph of the Article itself, for therein is mentioned several Churches in which the pure word of God is *not* preached. The third view seems, at the very least, as reasonable as the second, and to many will appear even more so, but it has not a particle of warrant in any of our official documents, and it seems to be in direct contradiction to the spirit of St. Paul's saying, "Ecclesia kat' oikon," as well as that of Tertullian, quoted by Bishop Jewel: "Yea, and be there but three together, and though they be laymen, *yet is there a Church!*" From these quotations, we see that the title may be given, as in *some* respects appropriate, even where there is no warrant whatever for administering sacraments or exercising any regular function of the ministry.

So then *literal* conformity on the part of any society to the Church's own definition is not indis-

* Richard Hooker and Bishop Bull were regarded as almost heretics, because they acknowledged that the Church of Rome was a Church at all, or that salvation could be obtained by any one living in communion with her.

† Newman and Keble, as quoted before, on page 57.

pensible to acknowledgment of ecclesiastical character; and if this be so, still less requisite is conformity to the opinions or requirements of an individual or a party. One person might insist that unless the doctrine of "imputed righteousness," or "perseverance," be taught, the truth is not set forth, and consequently there is no Church; and another may hold that unless there is a complete and regularly consecrated ministry, there can be no administration of sacraments, and consequently no Church of Christ in any sense whatever, but both are wrong; they undertake to determine what the Church has not determined, and on the authority of their own private judgment they deny *wholly*, that which more moderate men are willing to acknowledge *in part*.

There is a sense then in which the name of Church may be freely granted to all those Christian bodies for which it is claimed. Let it be understood to mean no more than that the Society is part of the great body of persons who believe in the Lord Jesus — let the Church Catholic be regarded as the Congregation of all those who profess and call themselves Christians — who hold either in form or substance the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and who are baptized in the name of GOD, THE FATHER, THE SON, and THE HOLY GHOST, and then there can be no hesitation in granting that the "Evangelical denominations" are included in it. The name of "Church" may be freely given to the Romanists, on the one hand, or to the Presbyterians, on the other. But in neither case does such use of the word imply that the body is all that it ought to be in doctrine or

constitution, or that we should receive its Ministers as orthodox and validly commissioned.

The definition just offered, is, we believe, *implied* in the "prayer for all sorts and conditions of men" in our matchless Liturgy. It is certainly not narrow or uncharitable, nor is it too lax. It grants no more than the whole world concedes, and what we believe God himself will acknowledge. It surrenders nothing that is a matter of faith or conscience.

It is somewhat strange, however, that even in this most general sense the English Church has never once in an official document given the title to any Non-Episcopal body.* This fact does not, in our opinion, justify the inference that many draw from it, but yet it deserves some consideration. If, as our author thinks, there was evident care taken in drawing up our formularies and profession of faith, "not to exclude" Non-Episcopalians, this fact certainly goes as far to show that care was taken *not to recognize* them.

To get over this great difficulty, Mr. Goode and his followers endeavor to show that the bodies they patronize were held in full honor and esteem by the English Church, and they proceed thus: 1st. They boldly claim as Presbyterian a Church which had both Bishops and Archbishops, and then in the fact that it was named among those that were to be publicly prayed for, they affect to find a recognition of *Non-Episcopal* Churches!† 2nd. They point to the desired title as occurring in a private letter, or

* Such mention *may* have been made, but after diligent search we have not found it.

† Goode on Orders, pp. 19, 20. Also, True Churchmanship Vindicated, by Rev. M. Gallagher, p. 30.

some other document, for the language of which the Church is not responsible, and this they represent as official acknowledgment. Thus our author, speaking of the Act of Uniformity, A. D., 1662, says that there is even in it a distinct "recognition" of the Non-Episcopal bodies.* We turn to the law [14 Car. ii. Cap. iv.], and there we read:

"§ 15. *Provided:* That the penalties of this Act shall not extend to the *foreigners*, or *aliens* of the foreign reformed churches allowed, or to be allowed, by the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, in England."

And so *mere mention of the word* "Churches," and *that in an Act of Parliament*, which those writers claim to have been "dictated by state policy," is a full or "*distinct recognition of the Non-Episcopal bodies!*"

In the preface to our American Prayer Book, the word occurs in the same way, *mere mention* is made of other religious bodies by the title they receive in common parlance, and this is triumphantly pointed to as a very positive recognition.† On the same principle, whenever we mention a "Unitarian," we must be supposed to acknowledge that the word properly describes the character of his belief. Or if we say a Minister is a "Baptist," we acknowledge that he belongs to the body which alone baptizes properly! No such claim is ever advanced, and it would not be granted, for a moment, if it were. The use of such words involves no "acknowledgments" or admissions whatever. Unless we would be considered markedly uncivil, we must conform to the

* See the same assertion in the Review of the Pastoral Letter, issued by Bishop H. Potter, by Rev. Dr. Canfield, p. 18.

† Letter to Right Rev. Horatio Potter, D. D., Bishop of New York, by the Rev. E. H. Canfield, D. D., p. 9. Also, his "Review," p. 8, and Gallagher's "True Churchmanship," p. 10.

common speech of the times, and give to all others the titles which they claim, or which custom has sanctioned, and this we may do without any, the least, compromise of principle. No fair antagonist will attempt to find anything like a "recognition" or "admission" in such courteous yielding to ordinary usage.* If this is a new thing with our author, if he is not familiar with such phrases as "the Unitarian Church," or "the Universalist Church" his American friends and disciples certainly are, but they would never dream of supposing that such language involved full recognition of the bodies thus indicated. Yet doubtless even these were among the "Churches" so called in the preface to our Book of Common Prayer.

Unchurching.—This is a word of mischievous character, seldom or never used (at least in this day), by any one friendly to the Episcopal Church. It is mischievous because it is indefinite, and yet carries odium with it. The accusation against us that we *unchurch* other bodies makes us appear as most uncharitable; but when examined closely, it means simply this: that we are not *latitudinarian.* We have a decided and conscientious preference for the Church to which we belong, and therefore will not admit that other religious bodies are *in all respects as Scriptural and complete as it is.* This is the head

* If the Reader will take the trouble of examining Dr. Hook's Church Dictionary, he will find it stated, that Church Clergymen (however "high" their views) never hesitate to give the title, "Rev.," to the "Dissenting teacher," whose clerical character they will not, for a moment, admit. And if he will look into Butler's book on the "Confessions of Faith," he will see in probably a hundred places *the word* "Church" *applied to the Protestant denominations, by a Roman Catholic controversialist.*

and front of our offending. This causes all the complaints. If we say to Non-Episcopalians, "We are perfectly willing to acknowledge you as Christians, and to confess that in connection with your societies salvation may be had; but we think your doctrines erroneous, or your organization mainly defective, or your ministry unauthorized," such a profession would not be favorably accepted. The answer would be, "That, sir, is just as bad as unchurching us;" but it is far from it. The real extent of our uncharitableness is simply this: Not that we deny to the various Non-Episcopal societies all Christian or Churchly character, which alone would be "unchurching" them, but that we do not look upon them as the equals, or even, possibly, as the superiors of our own.

We are aware that some few Ultraists have declared that bodies having a defective organization cannot possibly be regarded as Churches *in any sense;* and that their members, if they can be saved at all, will be saved only through "uncovenanted mercy." But with this view we have no sympathy; we repudiate it utterly, and we deny that the Episcopal Church is responsible for it. So few are the holders of it, that we believe it would be impossible to find even *twelve* men of any weight in our body who have ever defended it. Yet this is the doctrine generally described by opponents as that of the whole Protestant Episcopal Church; and it is that which, by Mr. Goode, is attributed to all who differ with him on the subject now discussed.*

Properly speaking, there can be no such thing as

* "Goode on Orders," Introduction, p. viii.

unchurching. save by the parties concerned. If they possess the true and necessary characteristics of Churches, they are such in despite of what we or any others might say; and if they do not possess them, all the wrangling that could be done from now until doomsday could not better their case. Their right does not at all depend on our favor, but on their own faith and practice.

"High Churchman" and **"Low Churchman."** —These names were at first used to designate parties who differed rather about political than religious matters. And although they have lost this original application, it must be confessed that there is something even yet in the differences between the two which closely resembles those between the political parties in all free countries. The High Churchman is simply the Ecclesiastical "conservative," and the Low Churchman the Ecclesiastical "liberal."

It would not be possible to describe either in a manner that would give satisfaction, or indeed without running to some extent into the misrepresentations and extreme statements against which they each have reason to protest. The present writer regards the *normal* representatives of both classes as loyal to the Church, devotedly attached to its services, and firmly persuaded of its full sufficiency and authority. They both give the first place in their reverence and regard to the Holy Scriptures, and the second to the Book of Common Prayer; and they both desire (and desire equally) to see the work of the Lord prosper in their hand. The differences between them may be fairly stated thus:

The High Churchman values the regular ordinances

of public worship, and especially the Sacraments, more highly than his "Evangelical" brother does. He attaches more importance to the polity and discipline of the Church, and is more jealous than the other of anything that looks like or seems to threaten a breach of its unity. He is a lover of good works, and always insists upon them as necessary to the completeness of the Christian character. He is not given to novelties either in doctrine or practice. He follows the faith of his fathers, not simply because it was theirs, but because it commends itself to his intellect and heart; and he finds its best exposition and defence in the writings of the theological giants of his own Church. Jewel and Hooker, Andrews, Hall, Chillingworth, Barrow, Jeremy Taylor, Sanderson, Bull, Hopkins, Hammond, Pearson, Farindon, and Waterland, are his favorites; and in them he finds a strength and fullness for which he might search in vain elsewhere. Therefore his library contains comparatively few *new* books. And so it is with his Church. It has an old-fashioned air; its decorations are what they always were; its services do not vary in accordance with the prevailing notions or supposed necessities of the age.

The Low Churchman is more afraid of formalism than of irregularity. He has certainly no love for schism, but is not quite so averse to it, nor so suspicious of it, as his brother. He loves the Liturgy, but yet acknowledges that he would fain see a few changes in it. His attachment is not so perfect that he will not, when occasion serves, dispense with its use. He also is zealous for good works, but fearing that, if much insisted on, they might be regarded as

meritorious, he prefers to make *faith* the chief subject of his discourse. He has less reverence for antiquity, and more sympathy with the spirit and labors of the present, than the other. He imports much of his theology, or at least finds much that is agreeable to him, in other than Episcopal divines. Like his High Church brother, he too has Hooker, Hall, Pearson, and Hopkins in his library, but alongside are Owen, Erskine, Baxter, Bates, Doddridge, and Dwight, or possibly Richard Watson and the saintly Fletcher. He looks upon his own Church as the purest and most complete branch of the great household of faith, but he has great charity for those who belong to other folds, and he is always ready to say from his heart, "Grace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

There are ultraists in both these parties, and, like most other extremes, they meet. The particular in which they agree is this, that neither are fully satisfied with the Church just as it is. Although they would carry out their views in very different ways, they agree in believing that it requires improvement. Like the coats in Dean Swift's story, the Church would soon assume a motley aspect, if these were allowed to fashion it here and there, after their new theories. One would bedizen it with extra lace and other ornaments; the other would rather tear off the little that is left. Meanwhile, he who is entirely content with it in its present state, and so feels bound to resist the efforts of both, is looked upon as a common enemy.* But enough on this subject.

* Bishop Henshaw, in his Memoir of Bishop Moore, has (in the way of supposition) sketched the High and the Low Churchman in the two

As regards the question before us, the High and the Low Churchman unite in considering Episcopacy a divine institution, and a properly derived authority a *sine quâ non* to lawful ministering in the Church.

---

phases of those characters, namely, the normal or moderate, and the extreme. His description of the latter is in substance this:

The EXTREME High Churchman depends on union with an Apostolic ministry and the reception of Sacraments duly administered. He reverences tradition, or at least the opinions of the Fathers, as constituting with Holy Scripture the rule of Faith. He discountenances all religious associations or services, however good their object, that are not in direct harmony with the spirit or appointments of the Church, and seems to regard a prayer-meeting as more dangerous than a meeting for worldly amusements. He holds the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration in its strongest sense, and is willing to rest in it, being comparatively indifferent to renovation of heart.

The EXTREME Low Churchman attaches little importance to Episcopacy; he regards it as resting on no higher ground than that of expediency, and therefore not at all necessary to the being of a Church, nor even necessary (when rightly considered) to its *perfection*. He looks upon the Sacraments as mere matters of form and ceremony [to be observed in obedience to divine command], rather than as signs and seals of the covenant of grace [or "means whereby we receive" spiritual strength and comfort]. His regard for the Liturgy is loose and languid, and he is willing to abridge or mutilate it, or even to omit it altogether, as convenience or caprice may dictate.

It will be seen from these sketches that the good Bishop was not wholly free from bias. To the Ultraist on one side he gives only the character of an *irregular* Churchman; while the other is represented as no more than a mere formalist, destitute of all true religious feeling or practical godliness. This is not just. That there are such we do indeed believe; but no less firmly do we believe, much as we differ from them, that many even of those called "Puseyites" are eminently devout and earnest-minded Christians.

With the exceptions thus indicated, the descriptions are fair. They might be supplemented thus:

The EXTREME High Churchman pays scrupulous regard to the Rubrics, regarding them as an iron rule, while the other looks upon them as possessing no real force or importance, mere dead letters, so far as they interfere with modern notions or convenience, or what he calls "charity." The extreme Low Churchman is generally [not invariably] a Calvinist; the other rejects all predestinarian views. In their views of the Sacraments they differ no less. The latter holds a doctrine not unlike the consubstantiation of the Lutheran; the other holds that of Zuingle, or even of the Socinians. The EXTREME Low Churchman looks upon the Pope as the true and only Antichrist, and fancies that he can see a leaning towards him in the cut of a coat, or the wearing of a clerical vest; the other believes that "there are many Antichrists," especially those who "deny the Father and the Son," and he sees in loose views of Church polity a tendency to this destructive system. The EXTREME High Church-

They also agree in believing that real necessity in this, as in every other matter, abrogates law, and makes valid whatever is performed under it. But the High Churchman is not quite willing to grant that there was insuperable difficulty in the way of the Continental Reformers; still less will he acknowledge that their descendants have the least excuse for retaining an imperfect ministry. He is impatient of their course.

The Low Churchman thinks the original necessity was real, or at least he is willing to grant everything in that way which was claimed at the time. He is also willing to grant that what it was lawful for Farel and Viret to do, was no less lawful, or excusable, in Beza or Sadeel. He is also disposed to regard the political and other circumstances of Continental Protestants even now as sufficient to constitute a *quasi* necessity, and thus to legalize their still defective polity and irregularly appointed ministry. So that, although he greatly prefers the Apostolic Order and the duly commissioned Clergy of his own Church, if he were in France or Germany he would not hesitate to commune with the Non-Episcopal Churches there; he could not bring himself to consider or treat them as wilful schismatics, having neither ministry nor sacraments.

---

man has not much sympathy for any who are outside the pale of the Church as he regards it, while those are the very persons for whom the other has the most. The EXTREMELY "low" are fond of the doctrines and terms of Puritanism, and engage as far as they can in its "new measures." The EXTREMELY "high" have no less marked fondness for doctrines, terms and practices that are not Protestant. They regard the Lord's supper as a real sacrifice; they believe in authoritative or *positive* "absolution;" they set up confessionals. They take special delight in altars, super-altars, lights, and multitudinous crosses, in vestments and various-colored "altar-cloths," that are not recognized "in this Church." They speak of "matins" and "even song," of "vespers," "octave" and "compline!"

As to the case of Non-Episcopalians here or in Great Britain, where no necessity ever was or could be pleaded, there is less room for difference. All consistent Churchmen regard them as wilfully rejecting a divine institution and preserving an unauthorized ministry. But those called High Churchmen and Low Churchmen differ as to the degree of criminality there is in such a course. The former consider the dissenter as living in Schism, a state of positive sin, which should be neither countenanced nor excused. The latter would like to blunt the edge of this judgment. He is obliged, indeed, to condemn, but he does it with regret, and with the avowal of his belief that the guilt may in the end prove less than we suppose. The more marked his Low Churchmanship, the more ready he is to look upon the condition of Non-Episcopalians as not necessarily involving any criminality, although he cannot venture to say it is proper. He would prefer being wholly silent upon the matter.

Fear of passing uncharitable judgment, or unwillingness to state disagreeable truths, makes him avoid as far as possible all reference to this precise point, and all discussions that would lead to it;* and thus he necessarily appears less zealous in his attachment to

* No more worthy representative of the class here referred to could be named than the late Rev. Dr. Bedell, of Philadelphia; yet his own confession fully sustains the statement made above. "He said that, like many who thought and acted with him, he had *for years* said little on the *peculiarities* of our Church, but the period had arrived when *they should be taught and preached.* While many in their preaching had given them too much prominence, *he had given them too little;* but the state of the times seemed to require it." "He then added very emphatically, 'If God spares my life, I intend delivering a course of sermons on Episcopacy this winter.'"—(*Tyng's Memoir,* page 228.)

Unfortunately the good intention was never carried out; the acknowledged defect was never supplied.

the principles of his own Church than he ought to be. If indeed the whole subject of Succession or ecclesiastical government is put before him, he will declare and defend the doctrine of his Church, but beyond the statement of general principles he will not go. If told that even those principles condemn all dissenters, he says, "Nay; I make no special applications, I draw no inferences."*

We object to this course on the ground that it is neither candid nor consistent. To avoid the conclusions that necessarily follow from his own reasonings, or to disclaim them when pointed out by others, is not the part of a sensible and honest man. If the premises are true and the reasoning correct, we *must* accept the inferences. We cannot escape them. So long as we try to do it, going just *so* far and no further, we are like him who keeps zealously saying all through his life, "Two and two are —," "two and two are —," yet never has the courage to bring out the inevitable "four!"†

But whether we say it or not it *will be said*, and if it should happen that any who hear it are aggrieved, they will not think the more highly of us for our attempt at concealment. For instance, when the Non-Episcopal minister who has been treated as a brother, and has had every reason to suppose that we looked upon him as our equal in office, finds that this is not really so,—when he sees clearly that, after all, our principles do invalidate his authority, he will cease to respect us—not for the sake of the principles, but

* Examination of Mr. Barnes's "Reply," by one of the Editors of the Episcopal Recorder. Philadelphia, 1844, page 116.

† This illustration is borrowed from a sermon by the Rev. Dr. Butler, of Philadelphia, who applies it to those who are on the "Road to Rome."

of the concealment. An open, manly avowal of the belief we conscientiously hold would not prove half so offensive as this apparent double-dealing. And thus in place of earning favor we provoke indignation, instead of friendly regard we meet contempt. Surely then "Honesty is the best policy!"

But we object to the course referred to for another very important reason. It is unfaithfulness and tends to greater unfaithfulness. "The fear of man bringeth a snare" — one from which it is not easy to get free. The more we yield the more we are required to yield until nothing is left. He who for the sake of what is so erroneously styled "charity" suppresses truth, will by and by surrender it. He that is either afraid or ashamed to acknowledge the results of his own reasoning will soon repudiate them, and then when farther pressed, rather than retrace his steps he will deny the premises also.* In this way he who was a true Episcopalian becomes one of an ultra party whose proper place is elsewhere, and in his new zeal he condemns all who are not as ready as himself to slight sacred obligations and abandon the distinctive principles of his Church.

To such a person a book like Mr. Goode's is thrice welcome. To him its "arguments" appear all that can be desired, and its "facts" indisputable. Why should he not rejoice over it and extol it when it so thoroughly meets his wants? It asserts that Apostolical Succession is a "monstrous" doctrine opposed to evangelical truth, and to the facts of God's providence — it asserts that Episcopacy is only an inven-

* Fortasse non redeunt quia suum progressum non intelligunt."

tion of man — that Bishops and Presbyters are really the same, and therefore that he is at liberty (especially in the case of a "moral emergency") to ignore the common distinctions between various churches—yea, even to look upon his Bishop as simply, by God's appointment, a presbyter like himself, and consequently one to whom he need not "give place by way of subjection. No! not for an hour!"

It requires no great sagacity to foresee the results of such teaching. It necessarily leads to *practical* evils, to infringements of established law and usage, to contempt for order and authority, to the rejection of pastoral admonition, probably to obstinacy and defiance, and then certainly to STERN DISCIPLINE or DESERTION.

CHAPTER IV.

MR. GOODE'S INTRODUCTION.

WE do not think that it would be possible without giving up all pretence of honesty to put into six or seven pages a larger number of misstatements, or a greater quantity of objectionable matter than the "Introduction" contains. There is hardly a sentence in it that is not open to censure. But as we have already referred to it, we shall not now go over it piece by piece. Much of what it sets forth as facts or truths will be disposed of in the answer to the more formal part of the book, and this (in connection with what has already been said of its purpose and character) prevents our having to treat it in detail.

But there are two or three paragraphs which cannot be passed by. To these then we will devote a few pages.

On page vii, the writer says of the theory or doctrine of "Apostolical Succession," "No trace of it is to be found in the Church of England until the time of Archbishop Laud, who was the first to introduce it."

The boldness of such an assertion is amazing. The writer must have counted strongly upon the ignorance of his readers when he ventured to print a state-

ment which any elementary text-book, or any history of the time would disprove. He is not willing even to confess as much as the opponents of "Succession" who have preceded him. They all indeed make it appear of much later origin than it was — nearly sixteen hundred years later! but still they do not attempt to show that it originated with Archbishop Laud. Most of them suppose they see the beginning of it in the reign of Elizabeth, at least from the time their ancestors, the Puritans, left the Church. Most of them accuse Bancroft,* some Montague, some Bridges, and some Whitgift; but they do not venture to assign to the doctrine a date so recent as our author has done. Even Hallam, the historian, who is specially unwilling to favor anything like High-churchism, speaks of "Bancroft and his imitators, Bishop Neile and Laud," as "*pursuing*" a system which had originated long before. Writing of them [*Sub. temp.* A. D. 1625–29]; he says:

"They began by preaching the divine right, as it is called, or absolute indispensibility of Episcopacy; a doctrine of which the first traces, as I apprehend, are found about the end of Elizabeth's reign. They insisted on the necessity of Episcopal succession regularly derived from the Apostles. They drew an inference from this tenet that ordinations by presbyters were in all cases null."—(*Constitutional History*, Vol. i., pp. 387, 388.)

Such doctrines were publicly maintained, while Whitgift was Archbishop of Canterbury, if not before. He was succeeded by Bancroft, and he in

* "Archbishop Bancroft in 1588 was the first Protestant in England that dared to publish the unscriptural dogma of Apostolical Succession as limited to those Episcopally ordained, thus denying the validity of the ordination in other Protestant churches."—(*The* [*Dissenters'*] *Library of Ecclesiastical Knowledge*, Vol. iv., p. 34, London, 1834.) See also Appendix, A.

turn by Abbott, on whose demise (*thirty years after Whitgift's death*) Laud was advanced to primatial dignity. Yet it has become so much the fashion to make him a scapegoat, that doctrines thus shown to have been taught at least a generation before, are declared to have originated with him; and that, notwithstanding the notorious fact that he never printed a line, until Elizabeth had been twenty years in the tomb.*

But the writer of the "Introduction" cares little about a trifling misstatement like this. Disproof of it, however, is not far to seek. His own book furnishes it. He and his followers quote as authorities against Apostolical Succession, and the allied doctrine of Episcopacy *jure divino*, such writers as Jewel, Hooker, Whittaker, etc. If then, as Mr. Goode asserts, these divines testified against the theory of "Succession," how can we believe his other statement that a man who lived a generation later was the "first to introduce it."

Doubtless Laud did hold the doctrine referred to. But he was neither its originator, nor its chief advocate, although from the many statements like that above, which are put forth from time to time, it might be supposed that he gave himself up almost entirely to its propagation. We see no evidence of such a thing. Does our Author offer any? Is any furnished by the gentlemen who repeat his statements? Not a particle! This fact is suspicious. It makes us doubt whether they have ever taken the trouble to make even a cursory examination of the

* Diary of Abp. Laud (Feb. 4, 1624), prefixed to Wharton's Edition of The Troubles and Trials.

writings of him whom they so readily condemn. Or possibly they have looked closely and found little that would justify their representations of his character and creed, and so, on prudential considerations, refrain from attempting to prove what they know will be readily believed. This may be the easiest way to gain their end, but it is not one which honorable men should adopt.

If, as they assert, the prelate in question introduced a new and anti-christian theory, which has led to great evils, the fact must be susceptible of proof, and proof should be given, if not for his sake, at least for that of those who make the assertion. And the simplest and best mode of justifying themselves would be to give us testimony from his own hand. The "father"* of all High Church bigots, the first who denied salvation to all who are not of our communion, the first to disregard gospel truth, in comparison with a mere "tactual succession," must surely have left in his writings enough to substantiate all that is said about him.

From his own writings then we ought to have had furnished to us some means of judging whether the portrait drawn in such dark colors is a faithful likeness. Some of his extreme opinions should have been printed, so that we might, at once, see the contrast they would present to sober and unexceptionable views — like these, for instance:

"Most evident it is that the Succession which the Fathers meant is *not* tied to place or person, but is tied to the 'verity of doctrine.' For as Tertullian [saith], expressly, 'Beside the order of Bishops running down in succession from the begin-

* Powell's Essay on Apostolical Succession, New York edition, 1855, p. 10.

ning, there is required *consanguinitas doctrinæ* — that the doctrine be allied in blood to that of Christ.' So that *if the doctrine be no kin to Christ and his Apostles, all the 'succession' become strangers, what nearness so ever they pretend.* And Irenæus speaks plainer than he: 'We are ready to obey those Presbyters, which, *together with the succession of their Bishoprics*, have received *charisma veritatis*—the gift of truth.' Now, Stapleton being pressed hard with these two authorities, first confesses expressly that 'Succession,' as it is a note of the true Church, is *neither a succession in place only, nor of persons only, but it must be of true and sound doctrine also.*"

In opposition to sentiments so reasonable and orthodox as these, why does not Mr. Goode print something from the hand of the hated Primate. *He does not, because he cannot, for those are the very words of Archbishop Laud himself!* *

* We are not admirers of Laud, yet we can never think of him in any other light than that of the most injured man whose name is mentioned in all English History. Hated and vilified in life, defamed by the help of forgery and fraud, cruelly murdered in his old age, and ever since represented as a foe to the liberties of man, and to the truth of God, he has received less consideration and justice than any public personage we know. It is so common and natural to abuse him, or hear him abused, that the uttering of even a word in his defence begets suspicion of heresy! It may not be amiss, however, without regard to consequences, to show how, in part at least, the common idea of his character has been built up. It is well known that Leighton (father of the excellent Archbishop) was tried before the Court of Star Chamber, for seditious libel, that he was found guilty, and sentenced to a very cruel punishment. All the popular accounts of this event (taken from Puritan sources) represent Laud as *having taken off his cap and offered up thanks to God, when the sentence was pronounced.* Symmons says that he had "dictated the sentence himself," and that afterwards he recorded it in his diary, "*with the cool malignity of a fiend.*" Unhappily, however, for the reputation of these Chroniclers, there is no proof whatever, that Laud had anything to do with either trial or sentence. *There is no evidence that he was even present at the time.* But further: "Neal, the great oracle, in the same Spirit, after relating the falsehood, that Laud pulled off his cap, etc., etc., thus proceeds: '*On Friday, November 6, part of the sentence was executed upon him* (says Bishop Laud, in his diary), after this manner (1) *he was severely whipt before he was put into the pillory.* (2.) *Being set in the pillory, he had one of his ears cut off,*' etc., etc. *But not a single word of all this description is to be found in the Diary.* A reference is made by Neal in the margin to Priestworth's collections, and strange to say, unluckily for Puritan veracity, not a single word of this story is to be found in Priestworth."— *Lawson's Life of Laud*, Vol. i., p. 533.

But to pass on. We are gravely informed that "Apostolical Succession," as taught by Laud, had most dreadful consequences, that it "overthrew both Church and State, and finally proved fatal to the house of Stuart." We fancy the writer of this sentence would find some difficulty in showing that the theory or doctrine named formed one of the articles of impeachment at the so-called "trial" of Charles, or that it had anything whatever to do with the struggle between him and the Parliament. And as to the "House of Stuart" we had always in our simplicity supposed that the members of it were especially interested in a very different "Succession."

A much more important misrepresentation, however, is the statement that

> "Nearly every secession from the Church (as many as forty to one) has been from the ranks of those who held the theory of Apostolical Succession in the most exclusive sense." (See page x.)

This is passing strange. The doctrine of Apostolical Succession might indeed have such effects if there were any doubt of our possessing that succession. But how mere belief of the necessity for a thing which we have in all its purity could render us dissatisfied and lead us to desert the Church is more than we can imagine!

If such were the tendency of the doctrine it would be manifested in the conduct of those who hold it: such of our clergy as do not agree with Mr. Goode would be found lamenting the defects of our Church and frequenting the services of others. Is this the case then? Are even those called "High-Churchmen" given to wandering about or fraternizing with

outsiders? Not such is the character generally given of them. On the contrary, the common reproach that they preach "The Church" more than "Christ" is sufficient to prove that they are not dissatisfied with the Church. They love it, they extol it, they labor for it, they cling to it just because they hold that very theory which Mr. Goode describes as calculated to promote secession.

It is a very easy matter to say, "Look at Oxford! Where are the Mannings, the Newmans, Wards, Fabers, and so forth, who from that seat of High Church orthodoxy preached Apostolical Succession?" The answer is ready — They have gone to their own place. It was not the doctrine of divine-right Episcopacy, assuredly that led them to desert a church in which that is a fundamental principle for one in which it is denied, or at best left open to discussion.* It was not the doctrine of Apostolical Succession which led them to acknowledge the authority of one who, as Pope, belongs to no such succession, having no scriptural warrant, and no transmitted commission! On the contrary, these very doctrines if they had held them, "as this Church hath received the same," would have had a powerful tendency to coun-

---

* The confused notions of Romish theologians on the subject of Order have been referred to. As to the doctrine of Succession the same difference of opinion exists among them. Cardinal Bellarmine, in one place, expressly denies it, thus: "Magnum est discrimen inter successionem Petri, et aliorum Apostolorum. Nam Romanus Pontifex proprie succedit Petro, non ut Apostolo, sed ut *Pastori totius ecclesiæ*, et ideo ab illo habet Romanus Pontifex jurisdictionem a quo habuit Petrus; at *Episcopi non succedunt proprie Apostolis* quoniam Apostoli non fuerunt ordinarii sed extraordinarii et quasi delegati pastores, qualibus non succeditur." — (*Opera*, Vol. i., lib. iv., cap. xxv. — *Elliot's Delineation of Roman Catholicism.*)

teract other influences and keep them faithful to their Church and to the truth of God.

But if we suppose for a moment that they were seduced by this "theory," would even that justify the statement of our Author? Let us consider the facts.

The Oxford perverts have not been by any means the only seceders from the Church in this generation. Among the friends of Mr. Goode himself there have been a few. Was it the doctrine of "Succession" that led them away? Was it belief of it that made Mr. Noel turn Baptist, or induced two other brethren in England to secede and found sects called after their own names. On this continent we have had some defections also. Two or three clergymen have become Methodists, two or three Presbyterians, one a Baptist, and one a Minister at large, disowning our communion and submitting to no authority. In Canada two at least became Irvingites. Were these and others of the same class misled by their regard for "Apostolical Succession?" How can their union with bodies who are supposed to repudiate succession be attributed to their believing it *indispensably necessary?*

It will be said such cases are of rare occurrence, while the Oxford perversions and those of the same kind are frequent. We deny this: at least we feel assured that full statistics would prove the common impression erroneous. We believe that the secession which "Puseyism" has caused have in the same time been equalled in number by those that took place under the system of Mr. Goode. Those that occurred at Oxford were more simultaneous, and the parties

more prominent, consequently they engrossed more of the public attention, and were supposed to be far greater in number than defections on the opposite side.

But when we look back at the history of our Church, the magnitude of Mr. Goode's misstatement is apparent. From the accession of Edward VI. to that of William IV., a period of almost 300 years, there were not from among the thousands of Bishops and other clergy even a score of perversions that could be legitimately traced to the doctrine in question, and it may be questioned if there were *one;* while the same period saw the perversion of *thousands* who left the Church chiefly because they did *not* believe the divine right of Episcopacy and the theory of Succession.

Is this fact questioned? If it be, we ask who and what were the Puritans — the Nonconformists? Did they not fly off from the Church and erect tabernacles of their own? Were they not at first dissatisfied and disorderly members, and finally bitter enemies of the Church? Did they not trample it to the ground when they had the power, and then fill the whole land with fanaticism and infidelity? And are not their descendants of the present day in reality as bitterly hostile to the Church as ever was Penry or Bastwick? To what then is *their* course attributable? Will Mr. Goode, in the face of all history and experience, and in the face of their own professions, claim these as believers in Apostolical Succession? If not how will he excuse the gross misstatement in his book?

The case stands thus: One or two hundred men

in this generation who held views on Succession and Episcopacy different from Mr. Goode, have left the Church of England; while hundreds of thousands have left her, and millions of their descendants keep aloof from her mainly because, on these same points, they agree with Mr. Goode. And yet that gentleman has the boldness to set forth an allegation like this—that of the seceders from the Church a proportion so large as forty to one has been from the ranks of those who hold the doctrine of succession in "the most exclusive sense."

But as the comparative influence of Mr. Goode's opinion and its opposite upon the numerical strength of the Church has been referred to by himself, we would take the liberty of reminding his readers that there is a very important point of view from which the Reverend gentleman has not ventured to look at the subject. There are and have been *accessions* to the Church, at all times far outnumbering the secessions from it. Now let us ask whether we gain most by the doctrine of Succession or by the latitudinarian doctrine set forth by Mr. Goode? If a man in the "ministry" of the Methodists or Congregationalists becomes doubtful of his right to hold the sacred office, to preach the life-giving Word, and administer the holy sacraments, and is investigating the whole subject of "ordination" and the "ministry" with a view to joining our Church, he finds two opposite theories presented to him. The one is to the effect that Succession is a figment, and the doctrine connected with it mere Popish superstition; that Episcopal ordination is not so necessary, but that without it he may be truly and properly a Minister of Christ; and that

therefore he may with a clear conscience and entire satisfaction continue to act under the commission he holds already. The other is, that without the laying on of the hands of a Bishop (who alone has authority to ordain), he cannot be truly and properly a minister of Christ. One party says to him, "Stay where you are, sir!" The other says, "Come and receive a valid commission!" Need we ask which is most likely to bring increase to the Church?

Look over the list of our Clergy, and inquire as to their histories. Observe how many of them have come to us from without. What induced them? Some may have come because they thought one denomination as good as another, and they supposed they could gain a little in comfort or respectability by the change. Some few have come in the charitable hope of doing us good, by infusing into our dead organism a portion of that spiritual life which other "Evangelical" bodies possess; but the rest of that honorable host have come because they discovered that the doctrine of Apostolical succession is *true*, and thenceafter they could not conscientiously minister with an insufficient authority. In our pulpits and by our Communion tables they stand to day, a living contradiction to Mr. Goode.

Another of the bold misstatements in this Introduction is that contained in the same paragraph, to the effect that repudiation of Apostolical Succession and divine-right Episcopacy have done most for the Church in the way of *extending* it at home, *promoting its spiritual life, and propagating it in heathen lands.*

As to the two former of these points we shall say but little. It would be very uncivil to doubt the

Reverend gentleman's own assertion, that he and those who agree with him have done more to extend the Church than all others; and as to "spiritual life," we believers in Episcopacy and Succession must confess, like good Bishop Griswold, that we have none — *to speak of!*

The paragraph we are considering (independent of its correctness or incorrectness in other respects) is one of the most wretchedly constructed sentences we have ever read. We presume the meaning of the last clause is, that those who repudiate Apostolical Succession have been "exclusively those who have propagated the Church, in connection with the Gospel, in heathen lands."

This astounding misstatement is put forward with such an assured air, that those who know nothing of the facts would naturally accept it. But let us see what the facts are.

The immense majority of Church missionaries have been the agents of the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. This and its companion, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, were in the field *nearly a century before any other Protestant organization* for the support of Christian missions, or for the distribution of Bibles and religious works. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was founded in 1701, and from that time to the present it has kept steadily at its great work. Its expenditure has been vastly greater, its agents more numerous, its operations more extensive and important, than those of any other single Missionary Society. It has in connection with it over forty Missionary and Colonial Bishops, at least

five hundred regularly ordained clergymen, and, in addition to these, the number of divinity students, catechists, schoolmasters, and others employed or maintained by it, in whole or in part, is about eight hundred.* These are found in every British colony and in almost every heathen land, wherever a door has been opened to them for the preaching of the Gospel of Christ. From north to south, from east to farthest west; under the burning sun of Africa and amid the terrible snows and ice-blasts of Prince Rupert's Land; in the West Indies and the vast plains of Hindostan; in Borneo, Australia, New Zealand, Vancouver's Island — everywhere, they raise the Christian standard, preaching pardon and peace through the blood of the cross. Thus is that noble Society doing the work of the Church, in accordance with the commission given by the Lord; thus it has been engaged for over one hundred and sixty years. To it our American Church owes its "first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection." And as it was here, so has it been in the British Provinces near us. There, there are many stations which for a hundred years have received, and are yet receiving, the generous support of this Society. Assuredly then it can point to a history and a present work of unequalled extent and usefulness. Surely, without any, the least, disparagement of the noble Church Missionary Society and the Colonial Church and School Society (which are comparatively of very recent origin), it may be safely stated that the

* The operations of the Society may be yet more extensive; we have not seen a report for four years past.

great work of extending the Church in heathen lands has been performed chiefly by its agents.

The question then arises, What is the general character, what the tone of this venerable Society? How does it stand as regards the matter before us. Is it "Latitudinarian?" is it even distinctively "Low Church?" Far from it. It has never taken any party position (it is too grand an association for *that*), yet on this, which is *not* a question of party, its position is well known. It is eminently conservative. It has ever been decidedly Episcopalian in spirit, and it is so to-day.*

The very existence of the other societies above mentioned is plain proof that the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was not all that even moderate Low Churchmen would desire. They founded others to share its work and its honors; but would this have been done if that Society were conducted on such principles as our Author ventures to assert? It is just as far opposed to those principles (or rather

* The decidedly Episcopal character of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is shown by the code of "instructions for the Clergy employed" by it, drawn up in 1706, and still in use. We wish that space could be afforded for the whole code, so that its excellence might appear to all, but we cannot admit more than what bears directly upon our subject.

Article III. charges them to be fervent in prayer to God, to "*reflect seriously on their ordination vows*," and consider the account they are to render to the great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls at the last day." Article IV. charges them to acquaint themselves thoroughly with the *doctrine and discipline of the Church of England*, that they may *approve themselves as genuine missionaries of this Church*. Article V. requires them to study subjects of controversy, that they may be able to withstand those who are gainsayers; and Article XI. calls upon them to avoid all party names, and to preserve a Christian agreement and union one with another, as a body of *brethren of one and the same Church, united under the* SUPERIOR EPISCOPAL ORDER."

Yet Mr. Goode and his followers are not ashamed to say that *this* Society rejects the doctrine of Episcopacy, and endorses Presbyterian ordination.

of the Clergy of the English Church, and nineteen-twentieths of its laity repudiate the doctrines of Episcopacy and Succession! How this knowledge was arrived at we are not informed. That it could, by any possibility, be true, is hard to understand, if we consider what we have heard, for the past twenty or thirty years,—that the English Church was "rotten to the core," so filled with High Church leaven that it was the duty of "Evangelical" Churchmen to look for sympathy and co-operation among dissenters, rather than from its members! And besides, we have long been accustomed to the apologetic tone of all English "Low Church" journals and works, and every one knows that the members and admirers of the "Evangelical party" were rejoiced beyond measure, on account of the appointment, by the late Lord Palmerston, of some eight or nine Bishops, who, to some extent, sympathize with them. These facts militate rather strongly against Mr. Goode's assertion.

But there are others that meet it more directly still. We are able to put statistics in opposition to it. A prominent "Evangelical" Journal, some time ago, quoted as authority the Rev. Dr. Conybeare's classification of parties, and estimate of their numbers.*

We will refer to it then. The Rev. Doctor divides the Church into three parties or classes, each having its normal, its stagnant, and its exaggerated type. There are, in all, over seventeen thousand

* This was first given in the Edinburgh Review, and afterwards published by the Author, in a Volume of Essays, on subjects connected with the Church.

Clergymen in the Church; of these, one thousand are put down as extreme or "exaggerated" High Churchmen, and two thousand five hundred "exaggerated," or extreme Low Churchmen. This we believe altogether too large an estimate, but let it stand. The whole High Church class outnumbers the other by over five hundred Ministers (nearly a fourth of the number of *our* Clergy); and the very highest proportion that can be claimed for those who are loose in their attachment to Episcopacy, is ONE IN SEVEN, NOT SEVEN IN TEN!

We have one more sentence to dispose of, and then we shall have done with the "Introduction." On page six we read that:

"The Low Church view is, that Episcopacy has Apostolic precedent, but *not Apostolic command.*"

We beg leave to contradict the author. This is *not* "the Low Church view," if the great and good men who have been the most prominent leaders of the Evangelical section of the Church are the exponents of it. We expect to satisfy the reader that Mr. Goode and they are far apart in opinion on these subjects. Let us consider it then as HIS view. What is its precise meaning? Has Episcopacy in the Reverend gentleman's estimation only so much authority, as could be given by some precedent, opposed to the spirit of a command? For instance, we read of Apostolic contentions, as to who should be the greatest among them, and *per contra* we read the commands to be humble, "in honor preferring one another." Among the *precedents* we read of Paul contending so sharply with Barnabas, that they "parted asunder one from the other," and of the

same St. Paul withstanding "Peter to his face;" while among his *precepts* we read, "live peaceably with all men;" "let all bitterness and wrath and anger and clamor and evil speaking be put away from you, with all malice," and "follow after charity," which "beareth all things," which "suffereth long and is kind." It is to be hoped then that where, as in these cases, the precedent and the command clash one against the other, Mr. Goode would give to the system of the Church something more than the support of the former.

We presume the doctrine he advances is this. Where a system or practice has *only* precedent to support it, when there is no written command, nor any reference to it, either condemning or endorsing it, it is deserving of a measure of respectful attention, but is not to be regarded as generally and permanently binding. And this he holds is the case with Episcopacy. But, if it had been expressly commanded, it would be positively binding upon all men to the end of time.

If this be the doctrine, then we ask what measure of importance he attaches to Family Worship, to the giving of the Sacramental cup to the laity, or to the sanctifying of the Lord's Day. Small indeed must his regard for these things be, on the theory just stated. Yet we do not doubt that he prizes them all, and would strenuously defend them if assailed; we do not doubt that he regards them as clearly required of us, although the duty be ascertained only by inference.

But our author holds that if there were a *command*, there would then be no room to question the divine authority of the institution. Let us consider this.

Among the commands in the New Testament is one "to abstain from things strangled and from blood," and another enjoining silence upon women in the churches; and these, forsooth, are things to the level of which it is *popish* to "raise" Episcopacy! They continue, on Mr. Goode's showing, universally and perpetually obligatory, while the threefold ministry can only plead toleration as a thing not improper, because, as he says, it has only "precedent" to support it.

The Reverend gentleman undertakes to illustrate his meaning, and refers, for that purpose, to anointing of the sick, which he has no doubt was instituted by the Apostles. The only possible excuse for introducing any such reference lies in the supposition that the cases are equal; and thus we see the measure of value set upon Episcopacy by this professed Episcopalian. A thing totally neglected by every body of Christians is equally binding and important with the polity by which our Church is distinguished, and for which it claims divine authority! Conscious that such a presentation of the case will shock many of even *his* readers, the Reverend gentleman tries to soften it down by saying that he would not put the two things on a level, as of equal moment; but he does not say which he considers of greater weight. Let us supply the defect. Episcopacy is based upon precedent only, but anointing is positively enjoined by St. James; therefore (on the principles of Mr. Goode) the latter is by far the more important of the two!

We do the Reverend gentleman no injustice when we thus present a decision so absurd; it is the legiti-

mate consequence of his own reasoning. That which has "command" has, he declares, the *jus divinum;* that which is based on precedent only has it not· therefore "anointing the sick," although we know not that it was general even in the Apostles' day, or that it ever has been practised since, is of higher warrant than that system of Church Government which we do know to have been general in the time of St. Paul, and to have been *universally and exclusively followed for fifteen hundred years afterward!* The one which no Christian practically regards is positively "binding upon all;" the other, which the vast majority of professing Christians agree in accepting as the divine rule, is only to be received on the score of expediency! The one which everybody slights is perpetually to be observed; the other, which millions conscientiously receive, and which Mr. Goode acknowledges to be a divine institution, may yet be rejected by any man or any sect that pleases!

Surely the rule that leads to such a decision cannot be right.

But has Apostolic precedent really no greater value than Mr. Goode is willing to assign to it? What is Apostolic precedent? Not certainly the casual act of a single Apostle, nor even such an act of several of them as was *evidently* not meant to be imitated by others. When we use that phrase we refer to those deliberate actions of the Apostles which were general in their character, and by them regarded as important and designed to be perpetuated. Such things we hold to be binding on Christians. They cannot be neglected without sin.

This is, as nearly as possible, the rule of the late

Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta. Where such a precedent is clearly established, it has with him quite as much force as any Apostolic command, for it implies that, and more. It shows that it was both ordered by the Apostles, and practised by them, and has therefore all the support which their authority can possibly give.

Robert Hall's rule for ascertaining the value of a precedent is, that whatever the Apostles instituted or practised, which was not in itself necessarily brought about by temporary or local usage, or the difficulties of their position, has divine sanction, and is binding upon the Church of Christ. Apply this rule to Episcopacy. Was it a thing which they were by any stress of circumstances constrained to adopt? This question needs no reply.

But Episcopacy does not rest solely on "precedent;" it has "command" also. How do we learn the fact that the Apostles really instituted the precedent? How is their practice ascertained? Not exclusively by bare historical record in the book of Acts. We use also the injunctions, directions, etc., which we find elsewhere. And what are these? No one could believe that a work so mighty as the founding and organizing to completion of the whole Church could be done (as even Mr. Goode confesses that it was) in accordance with the system of Episcopacy, and yet no command in favor of Episcopacy be given, either in speech or writing?* What, we would ask,

* Booth, the Baptist controversialist, says, in his "Apology," page 48: "If our brethren do not look upon the Apostolic precedent as *expressive of the mind of Christ*, and as *a pattern for future imitation*, they must consider the Apostles as either ignorant of our Lord's will, or as unfaithful in the performance of it."

was the appointment of any such officer as Titus was in Crete, but a command to him to enter upon the duties of the Episcopate, and a command to the people to receive the Episcopal form of government? What are the Epistles addressed to him and to Timothy, but directions or injunctions that are properly COMMANDS? What then becomes of the assertion that Episcopacy rests on precedent alone?

So far from this being true, our warrant does not stand solely on either the words or acts of the Apostles. Our author never refers to the existence of any system, or to the establishing of any office previous to the time of the Apostles' authority. We will not spend much time in supplying this omission, but simply state, what otherwise his readers might not know, that Episcopalians find in the arrangement of the ministry under the Mosaic dispensation (1) a clear proof that the system of "parity" is not what God favors, and (2) a very strong presumption in favor of a ministry having three degrees.* But this presumption is made yet stronger by the fact that our Lord Jesus Christ, himself the great High Priest, appointed two separate orders of Evangelists,—the twelve and the seventy. Those of the latter class were sent forth to do a certain work, and they had the powers proper for it; but perpetuating their order was no part of their duty; no promise was given to them extending into the remote future. How different was it with the twelve! To them, as the higher order, full powers were granted. Their ordinary com-

* St. Jerome, letter to Evagrius: "Quod Aaron, et filii ejus atque Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi, Presbyteri et Diaconi vindicant in ecclesiâ."—(*Sinclair's Dissertations*, page 97; and elsewhere.)

mission was necessarily to be handed down, and the promise would of course accompany it. Many find in this action of our Lord the true foundation of Episcopacy.

But suppose they claim too much (which we are far from granting), is there to be *no* regard paid to our Lord's course when we are considering this subject. We contend that *it must be followed;* but let it only be *considered,* and we will be satisfied with the result. By just so much as this authority, from which there is no appeal, discountenances Presbyterian equality, it favors some other system of a different character, some one that is more in accordance with the model He furnished. If ours be such a system, and if it be conceded that it has Apostolical precedent beside, what is wanting to place Episcopacy upon an immovable basis, and prove that it is binding upon all men to the end of time?

CHAPTER V.

THE PROPER SOURCES OF INFORMATION.

OUR author thus states the question, and the sources to which he thinks we ought to apply for an authoritative answer to it:

"The present question is simply this — whether it is a doctrine of the Church of England that Episcopal ordination is a sine qua non to constitute a valid Christian ministry? In order to a true answer we must examine

I. "The Articles and other formularies which relate to it, taken in their literal sense.

II. "The opinions of those who drew up these standards, as ascertained by their other writings, to be taken as guides to the sense in which they intended those standards to be received, *as also the opinions of the leading divines of the Church onward for a hundred years.*

III. The PRACTICE of the Church FOR A SIMILAR PERIOD, *as a further guide to the true interpretation of the standards,*"

Now, these are not the sources from which a true and authoritative answer can be elicited. We should like to know on what pretence the opinion of a man who lived a hundred years after Cranmer could be offered in evidence of Cranmer's meaning in the formularies, or why those who lived a little more than a hundred years after the Reformation should not be equally authentic exponents. Still more, we should like to know on what pretence the PRACTICE

of the Church for its first hundred years should be a rule to us, and its practice to-day and for two hundred years past ignored.

The true sources from which we are to gather the judgment of our Church upon this or any other point are:

1st. ITS DOCTRINAL AND DEVOTIONAL STANDARDS —the Liturgy Articles and Ordinal.

∴ These are to be taken in the plain sense of their words; and if there be room for any doubt as to their meaning, reference may be made to the other writings of those who were the *actual compilers* of them.

2nd. ITS LAWS and PRINCIPLES as set forth in canons, injunctions, declarations, endorsements, censures, etc.

∴ These are of the *most importance* when they come from the Church in its corporate capacity, that is in Convocation.

3rd. ITS PRACTICE (or administration of its own laws) ever since the Reformation.

∴ Of course this can only be referred to when the Church had full liberty of action.

4th. Those works which having been specially endorsed by the Church or enjoined by lawful authority, may be looked upon in the light of SECONDARY STANDARDS.

5th. And, least valuable of all, the OPINIONS OF DIVINES of the Church of England, from its foundation to the present time; and also of divines of our own Church since its separate organization.

∴ The reader will mark well that these opinions can be of use only as corroborative proofs of what the standards teach. Strong concurrent testimony from many writers is valuable corrobo-

ration, but even the strongest could establish nothing as the doctrine of the Church unless it be first found in the formularies or laws. Opinions of individuals, however correct they may be, are still only mere opinions, for which no one but the writer is responsible; and in this discussion they are valuable in proportion to the eminence (ecclesiastical and literary) of the authors.

Of course the writings of partisans of the present generation are not to be quoted as authority on their own side.

These are the sources then to which we shall look for the Church's answer to the questions, *What is the true and scriptural mode of Church government, and what constitutes a true and proper ordination?*

We prefer this mode of putting the case to that of our author. It is pretty much the same, yet not precisely. No one can reasonably expect to find in our formularies definite statements as to "*sine qua non*" qualifications, *validity*, etc., etc. The Church of England is not given to anathematizing, and still less to refining unnecessarily, especially as regards the affairs of others. She simply states her own faith, and leaves that statement to condemn whomsoever it will condemn. Thus her second article contains her declaration of doctrine as regards the eternal Son of God; it says not a word of Arian heretics, but it does virtually condemn them. As it is in this instance so it is in many others. The mere declaration suffices. Even the Augsburg Confession has its condemnatory clauses at the end of each article, but the English Church has generally in her formularies contented herself with affirming her own doctrine; and that is amply sufficient.

In connection with ordination then, we may expect to find one particular kind approved as scriptural, and therefore enjoined; and if that is so and no exceptions be made in favor of any other, the kind so endorsed is the *only one* which the Church can be said to acknowledge or of which she knows anything.

We should suppose there would be no difficulty in assenting to a proposition so plain as this, but we continually meet statements to the effect that the establishment of anything is warrant *for it*, but has no other force — that our Church's choice of Episcopal ordination sufficed only to show that to the founders of the body it appeared, on the whole, the best, and therefore they decreed its use; but this did not involve the condemnation of the "Presbyterian" or even the "Congregational" mode! Which is, as if a man should say, "The Reformers did agree that, on the whole, Baptism had better be practised. In the 27th Article they point out its use and the blessings accompanying it, and all this with a view to have it observed in *this* Church; but it surely was not their intention to disparage those good people who do not practise it. There is no such thing as mention of them, nor even a direct reference to them in the Article, *and as nothing is there said of the* ABSOLUTE NECESSITY *of water baptism we may take it for granted that the Church does not hold it, and also that the Article was carefully drawn up so as not to exclude or unchurch the Quakers!*

This is certainly cogent reasoning, and much of a piece with what we meet frequently now-a-days! We may refer to it elsewhere. At present we content ourselves with saying that mere *omission*, as a

general rule, proves nothing; and that when one of two opposite views is accepted the other is *necessarily* condemned. To say then that our Church has formed no judgment on Presbyterian Orders because they are not once mentioned in our formularies, or that the accepting and establishing of Episcopal ordination was not an exclusion or condemnation of the other, is just as reasonable as to hold that the Church has no unfavorable opinion of Mahomet, and her acceptance of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is not the rejection of Islamism because it is not denounced in express terms!

In connection with rites and ceremonies which are but ordinances of man, the Church teaches explicitly that upon just cause they may be changed or set aside. But of the essentials of doctrine or polity [for instance, the Ministry of divers Orders], or any other thing which she regards as having divine authority, she holds no such language. Those things are established, not by her power, but by God's, and it is her duty therefore to receive and preserve them, and to transmit them on to the generations to come. And her enunciation of them, accompanied with reference to God's Word is a virtual condemnation of the opposite.

We consider this so evident that we shall dwell no longer upon it, but proceed to examine certain public and private documents that date from before the establishment of the Protestant Church of England.

CHAPTER VI.

ANTE-REFORMATION DOCUMENTS.

ON the 23rd page of the work before us, we find the following passage:

"And we may notice, first, that even in the time of Henry VIII., at the very dawn of the Reformation, the bishops and clergy of our Church put forth a document containing the very doctrine on which the validity of Protestant ordinations has been chiefly rested, namely, the parity of bishops and presbyters, with respect to the ministerial powers, essentially and by right belonging to them."

The document to which the Reverend author refers, is the "Institution of a Christian man," drawn up by the Bishops and some of the clergy at the command of Henry VIII., and issued in the year 1537. It is frequently mentioned as the "Bishop's Book."

The reader will observe that in connection with it Mr. Goode states: (1st) That "at the very dawn of the Reformation" (an expression that he repeats more than once) we may notice a certain doctrine; thus intimating, though guardedly, that it had its origin then, or that it had at least some special connection with that great event. (2nd) That the doctrine thus

found at the period, and in the document aforesaid, is the "very" doctrine on which the validity of Presbyterian ordinations has been chiefly rested. (3rd) That the parties who penned the document in question were the "bishops and clergy of OUR Church."

We purpose in this chapter, then, to correct these errors—to show that the doctrine found in the document was at that time, and for several centuries had been, a generally received doctrine of the Romish Church — that it had no necessary connection with the Reformation more than any other event — that it is *not* the "very" doctrine of the Presbyterians, but just of the opposite character—that the "Institution" and the two other documents quoted by Mr. Goode in the same connection, are not in any sense standards of OUR Church, nor proper sources from which to infer Protestant doctrine — that the men who drew them up were all then Romanists, and though a few of them subsequently became confessors of a purer faith, the great majority lived and died Papists, and used all their powers to oppose the improvement in doctrine and worship then sought after.

By establishing these points we shall not only correct the errors of the paragraph above, but overthrow all that Mr. Goode has said in his twenty-third and six following pages of these Ante-Reformation writings; we shall prove that he has misstated the views of Archbishop Cranmer, and that being so, that he has not given *one* quotation in favor of his own theory from any of those who first protestantized the English Church and drew up its formularies.

1st. It is very singular that though Mr. Goode makes so much ado about the doctrine of "parity"

being found at the "very dawn of the reformation," he yet ventures to confess that

> "Those who are at all acquainted with Ecclesiastical history, know that this view had long been advocated by many of the divines of the Church of Rome, especially among the scholastic divines, including their great founder, Peter Lombard, the Master of the Sentences."

This avowal seems at once to destroy the doctrine in question as an article to be adopted by Mr. Goode and the Presbyterians. The Reverend gentleman, however, does not give us this information as a confession that the theory he maintains is a Romish doctrine; but (coupled with remarks elsewhere to the effect that "Apostolical Succession was not universally held in the Church of Rome itself before the Reformation") he uses it to show that even Papists are less exclusive or more liberal than those who are decided Protestant Episcopalians. How far this end will be promoted we shall see when the origin and nature of the theory in question have been explained.

About seven hundred years before the reformation Paschasius Radbertus and some others began to teach that, in the Sacrament of the altar the elements of bread and wine were totally changed into the veritable flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ as soon as the Priest had pronounced the words of consecration. This novel and startling doctrine was warmly opposed by John Scotus Erigena, Ratramnus and others; but, nevertheless, it gained such favor in the benighted Church that in the year 1215 she added to her other offences against God's truth this also, that she adopted Radbert's her-

esy, under the name of Transubstantiation, as an article of the faith.

This heresy assigns to the Priest power to perform a stupendous miracle every time he officiates at Mass —to make by his word a body for Christ —to "create God." From it, then, naturally enough, proceeded the notion that no class of men could be of a higher "Order" than these.

The Pope himself could work no mightier transformation than the most illiterate parish Priest who could get through the formula of consecration: * even the Pope then could not be, strictly speaking, of a higher "order" than the Priest. And if not the Pope, certainly not the Bishops, who were so much his inferiors.

This, then, was the source of the theory adopted at that time and still retained as a well-known doctrine of the Church of Rome, viz: that the priesthood is the highest Order in the Christian ministry. For at least three hundred years before "the dawn of the Reformation" it was the prevalent or almost universal doctrine, and was defended, when defended at all, by the very same references to sentences in St. Jerome which all Anti-Episcopalians make to-day.

* It is amusing to see this same argument protestantized and employed by a Wesleyan writer to justify Presbyterian ordination, thus: It is as plain as that two and two make four that the greater always includes the less. Now the two *sacraments* of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the greatest ritual observances in the Christian Church. A *sacrament* is by all divines considered above all other ritual ordinances. Ordination is *not* a *sacrament*. He that has power and *authority* to perform the *greater* has power and authority to perform the less. *All Presbyters*, by the confession of our opponents, have power and authority to administer the *sacraments* of *baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, the greater: *all Presbyters*, therefore, have power and authority to administer ordination, the *less*. — (*Essay on Apostolical Succession, by Rev. Thos. Powell.* Amer. Ed. p.130, note.)

At the Council of Trent (Session 23, caput 2) after much discussion it was formally acknowledged to be part of the creed of Rome.*

A statement of historic fact so indisputable as the above needs no corroboration to satisfy those who are so fortunate as to know anything of ecclesiastical history. But, as there are many who will not willingly accept facts that militate against their own notions, and as there are many others who have no knowledge of the circumstances and times referred to, and who may reasonably require to see some authority for our statement, we print one or two passages, which will be amply sufficient.

"The *Schoolmen*, having set up the grand mystery of transubstantiation, were to exalt the priestly office as much as possible; for the turning of the host into God was so great an action, that they reckoned there could be no office higher than that which qualified a man for so great a performance, * * * * * so they raised their Order or office so high as to make it equal to the Order of a Bishop; but as they designed to extol the Order of priesthood, so the *Canonists* had as great a mind to depress the Episcopal Order. They generally wrote for preferment, and the way to it was to exalt the Papacy. Nothing could do that so effectually as to bring down the power of Bishops.

"It was necessary to lay them as low as could be, and to make them think that the power they held was rather as *delegates of the Apostolic See*, than by a commission from Christ or his Apostles." "They looked on the declaring *Episcopal authority to be of divine right as a blow that would be fatal to the Court of Rome;* and therefore they did after this, at Trent, use all possible endeavors to hinder any such decision. *It having been then the common style of that age to reckon Bishops and Priests as the*

* If the reader has any desire to examine the precise view of the Roman sect upon this matter of Order, we would refer him to that most admirable and scholarly work, Elliot's Delineations of Roman Catholicism, English Edition, Imp. 8vo., 1851, page 396, etc. There it will be seen that the doctrine of that body is not clearly defined nor consistent, but with its internal controversies or inconsistencies we have nothing to do. It is enough for us to justify the assertion in the text.

same office [order], *it is no wonder if the clergy of this Church, the greatest part of them being still leavened with the old superstition * * * * retained still the former phrases, in this particular.*"—(*Burnet's History*, Bohn's ed., vol. i., p. 267.)

"The Council of Trent and the later writers in the Church of Rome have not greatly insisted upon the three Orders, but have generally classed together the first and second, Bishops and Presbyters, under the common name of *sacerdotes, priests;* influenced herein by the high importance which they attached to the priesthood, and by the disposition to reserve supreme Episcopal authority to the Pope."—(*Harold Browne on Articles*, London ed., p. 556.)

"I conclude the Romanists to have proceeded on *their well-known principle, that Bishops and Presbyters are not two distinct Orders*, but only two branches of one Order, the Sacerdotium or sacrificing priesthood." And again: "*The Roman tenet of the ordinal identity of the Bishop and Presbyter.*"—(*Faber on Transubstantiation*, London ed., *Introduction*, pp. 124, 5.)

Here then we have the theory of parity traced to its origin and its proper home. But Mr. Goode uses it himself, and claims it for Presbyterians. They are heartily welcome to it, such as it is, and to the companionship which it involves.

As this theory of parity, then, taught by the Schoolmen, by the document under notice, and by the Council of Trent, is shown to be originally and truly Roman Catholic, as it existed ages before the days of Luther, Cranmer, and Calvin, and has remained unaltered since, it could not have had any necessary connection with the Reformation. It was held by the men who drew up the "Institution," just as the real presence and the worship of Mary were held by them. This part of our task, then, is fulfilled.

2. We proceed now to show that it is *not* the "very" doctrine on which Presbyterians base their claim to ordain. Mr. Goode has not given their doctrine as they hold it. That of the "Institution" is a

parity of Bishops and Presbyters (with respect to *ministerial* powers); but the Presbyterian claims *identity* rather than parity. He knows no "Bishops *and* Presbyters," any more than he recognizes "Presbyters and Presbyters;" in his esteem every Bishop is simply an Elder, Presbyter, or Priest, and every such Presbyter is truly and fully a Bishop; and therefore, in his opinion, Presbyters are empowered to perform every rite and exercise every power necessary for the outward governance as well as the spiritual edification of the Church. Equality *quoad ministerium*, as St. Jerome said, goes only to the ministering of the word and sacraments, and (even by Jerome himself) was understood as always reserving the power of ordaining and governing to the Episcopal Order. Consequently such equality is not the doctrine on which the "validity of Presbyterian ordination has chiefly been rested," or ever could be rested. But is this the "parity" taught in the documents? Undoubtedly it is. Rome has always, though theorizing about sameness of "Order," put a broad distinction between the Bishop and the Priest, and preserved her principles and organization as a decidedly Episcopal Church.* It is no part of our duty to justify her course and attempt to reconcile her inconsistencies; we simply state the fact. Her transubstantiation heresy makes her unduly magnify her priesthood; her pontifical usurpation makes her

* Canon VI. Si quis dixerit, in Ecclesia Catholica non esse hierarchium, divina ordinatione institutam, quæ constat ex Episcopis, Presbyteris et Ministris; anathema sit.

VII. Si quis dixerit Episcopos non esse Presbyteris superiores, vel non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent illis esse cum Presbyteris communem * * * * anathema sit."—(*De Sacramento Ordinis Canones Concilii Tridenti.*)

deny superiority over Presbyters as inherent in the Episcopate by *divine right;* yet, lest she should become anarchical, she gives to her Bishops, from her Pope, authority to rule and ordain, which, coming from him who is Christ's vicar on earth, the infallible head of the Church, confers full and *divine* authority upon every one so commissioned! And thus we have parity and disparity working together in the same body. Now such is precisely the theory revealed in the documents.

Let us examine them. If they mention or intimate an equality in "Order" between Bishops and Priests, that fact does not help Mr. Goode at all; for Rome holds that notion. If they mention or intimate *any* distinction between Bishop and Presbyter, they certainly do not favor Presbyterianism. If such distinction be in connection with the power of ordination, then they are *hostile* to that system, and Mr. Goode is completely at fault.

In the "Institution" (Oxford edition, 1825, p. 101) we find the following statement of the powers and duties of the ministry in general:

"As touching the sacrament of holy Orders, we think it convenient that all Bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach the people committed unto their spiritual charge, first, how that Christ and his Apostles did institute and ordain, in the New Testament, that besides the civil powers and governance of kings and princes (which is called *potestas gladii*, the power of the sword), there should also be continually in the Church militant certain other ministers or officers, which should have special power, authority, and commission, under Christ, to preach and teach the Word of God unto His people; to dispense and administer the sacraments of God unto them, and by the same to confer and give the grace of the Holy Ghost; to consecrate the blessed body of Christ in the sacrament of the altar; to loose and absolve from sin all persons which be duly penitent and sorry for the same; to bind and excommunicate such

as be guilty of manifest crimes and sins, and will not amend their defaults; to order and consecrate others in the same room, order, and office whereunto they be called and admitted themselves; and finally to feed Christ's people like good pastors and rectors (as the apostle calleth them) with their wholesome doctrine, and by their continual exhortations and admonitions to reduce them from sin and iniquity, so much as in them lieth, and to bring them unto the perfect knowledge, the perfect love and dread of God, and the perfect charity of their neighbors."

Mr. Goode quotes *part* of this paragraph, adroitly stopping short in the middle where the Roman theology is revealed too plainly for his purpose.

Now, who are they to whom (without specifying the duties of each) the above have been thus generally assigned? The answer is given throughout the whole work, and not merely in the short paragraph which Mr. Goode appends to the above, as if it followed it in regular order, though it is separated by four pages in the original work! Sometimes they are spoken of as one order, and deacons as another. They are called "Bishops and Priests," and "Priests or Bishops." (See pages 104–5.)

Now when we find the words united as above by the copulative conjunction, "Bishops and Presbyters," we have it clearly indicated that however much parity of Order be believed there is also held with it a real distinction between the offices, and this is inconsistent with Presbyterianism. But let us see in what the distinction consists.

Ordination is thus referred to (page 105):

"The sacrament of Orders may worthily be called a sacrament, because it is a holy rite or ceremony instituted by Christ and his Apostles in the New Testament and doth consist of two parts, like as the other sacraments of the Church do, that is to say, of a spiritual and an invisible grace, and also of an outward and a visible sign. The invisible gift or grace conferred in this sacrament is nothing else but the power, the office, and

the authority before mentioned. The visible and outward sign is prayer *and imposition of the* BISHOP'S *hands* upon the person which receiveth the said gift or grace. And to the intent the Church of Christ should never be destituted of such ministers as should have and execute the said power of the keys, it was also *ordained and commanded by the Apostles* that the same sacrament should be applied and administered *by the* BISHOP from time to time unto such other persons as had the qualities necessarily required thereunto."

Here, then, in the one point on which all the controversy turns, the "Institution" speaks *not* the language of Geneva, but the very opposite. Mr. Goode's weapon is found striking against himself!

Henry VIII. was by no means satisfied with "the Bishop's Book." He had cast off papal authority only that he might himself be pontiff within his own realm; and as his Bishops and courtiers had freely granted to him the supreme headship of the Church in England, he was determined to hold it, not as a nominal, but a real sovereignty. Of faith and practice he would be high arbiter. So long then as Reformation (without touching doctrines he approved, or powers and liberties that he coveted) struck at the Pope, or put monasteries at his mercy, or quietly extended the knowledge of religion among his people, he was favorable to it, but the moment it touched his power or opposed his private belief he put it back with fire and sword.

The "Institution" did not please him, and so a second edition of it, greatly enlarged and altered to suit his views, was issued in 1543, under the title of "A Necessary Erudition and Doctrine," etc. This is commonly known as "the King's Book;" in it the royal supremacy is intimated as extending to matters which the Reformed Church of England has never

allowed, and the doctrines are in some respects even more truly Romish than in its predecessor; but as regards the question we are considering there is no difference.

Thus two of the documents quoted by Mr. Goode are disposed of.

We now come to examine the third, which is by far the most important of all.

Three years after the publication of the "Institution," and three before the "Necessary Doctrine" was issued, the king put certain questions to the Bishops and some of the more learned of the priestly order, "touching the sacraments and the appointment and power of Bishops and Priests." The questions were seventeen in number, and with the answers given to them may be found in Burnet's History (Bohn's Ed., Vol. ii., Collection page 89 to 101, and more at page 389); in Collier's, and part of them which Burnet had at first omitted, may be found in Strype's Cranmer (Routledge's Edition, Vol. ii. pp. 295, etc.).

The commissioners were as follows: Bishops—Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury (whose connection with this matter we shall treat of separately); Lee, Archbishop of York; Bonner, Bishop of London; Tunstal, Bishop of Durham; Barlow, Bishop of St. Davids; Aldrich, Bishop of Carlisle; Skyp, Bishop of Hereford; Heathe, Bishop of Rochester; Thirleby, Bishop-elect of Westminster; and Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester.

Priests—Doctors Cox, Robinson, Day, Oglethorpe, Redmayne, Symonds, Tresham, Leighton, Corwen, and Crayford.

The reader who examines this list carefully will

not need to be informed of the character of the men whose opinions are quoted by Mr. Goode as those of the "Bishops and Clergy of OUR Church," the men who "drew up our standards" and "put forth the Ordinal!"*

With the exception of Cranmer and Barlow among the Bishops, and two, or at most three, of the other divines, hardly one of the twenty commissioners ever ceased to be the Romanist he was when replying to the King's questions; while as regards "bloody Bonner," the vilest of persecutors, and, as Hooper called him, "the most bitter enemy of the Gospel;" Gardiner, the cruel and wily fox, his associate in all evil; Thirleby, who was partner with them in the judgment and degradation of Cranmer; Heathe, "that most zealous Papist," and Day and Skyp, who as Bishops protested against the Prayer Book when first compiled, it is surely not necessary to add another word. The writer who cannot support his system without *their* help, and without representing *them* as "reformers" and "leading divines of OUR Church"—friends to that which they persecuted relentlessly—must surely feel the weakness of his cause driving him farther than his conscience can approve.

In the document composed by these commissioners we will of course find some slight differences of opinion, but yet a substantial uniformity. We shall find that the doctrine taught is precisely that in the "Institution," and that wherein it varies from it, to the

* Some of them were appointed to act on the commission for preparing the first Prayer Book and Ordinal; but there is no evidence that they ever served, and there *is* evidence that three at least protested against both works. One of the Bishops went to prison rather than approve the Ordinal, and all of the Romish party refused to use it, at least in consecrating Bishops.

slightest extent, it is to favor the royal power, and no other. Henry wanted authority to make Bishops and other ministers and to unmake them as he saw fit, and pointed his questions so as plainly to indicate his desires. He had repudiated the Bishop of Rome; now he wished to seize, as belonging of *divine right* to himself, spiritual and ecclesiastical authority over the English Bishops, so that their consent to any matter of doctrine and discipline would be less important than his own, and their presence and work not necessary to ordination and consecration, but that his mere *appointment* should suffice for all such purposes.

The ninth question reads thus:

"Whether the Apostles, lacking a higher power, *as in not having a Christian King among them*, made Bishops by that necessity, or by authority given by God?"

To this they all replied, that the Apostles had received divine authority to create Bishops. Lee, Archbishop of York (who appears to have replied very honestly and boldly to all the questions), declared no other authority was needed; while several of the others stated that the Apostles "ought to have asked license of their Christian governors, if there had been any!" The learned Dr. Redmayne, one of the very few who became Protestants, commented thus upon the word "make" in the query:

"This word *making* of a Bishop or a Priest may be taken two ways; for, understanding the word to ordain or consecrate, *so* it is a thing which pertaineth *to the Apostles and their successors only;* but if by this word (making) be understood the appointing or naming to the office, *so* it pertaineth specially to the *supreme heads and governors of the Church, which be princes!*"

The reader will do well to mark this distinction, as

some of the writers have not paid attention to it and the King repudiates it, asking, "Where is this distinction to be found?"

Question 10:

"Whether Bishops or Priests were first? and if the Priest were first, then the Priest made the Bishop?"

Archbishop Lee, of York, replies:

"We think that the Apostles were Priests before they were Bishops, and that the *divine power* which made them Priests made them also Bishops. * * * * * * And we may well think that then they were made Bishops, when they had not only a flock, but also shepherds appointed to them to overlook, and *a governance committed to them by the Holy Ghost* to oversee both; for the name of a Bishop is not properly a name of order, but a name of office, signifying an overseer. And, although the inferior shepherds have also cure to oversee their flocks, yet forsomuch as the Bishop's charge is also to oversee the shepherds, the name of overseer is given to the Bishops, and not to the other; and, as they be in degree higher, so in their consecration we find difference even from the primitive Church."

Mr. Goode has quoted this Archbishop as favoring his theory in the above answer. He does it by *omitting* all the first paragraph, and *commencing his extract in the middle of a sentence*, to avoid the statement that the Episcopal power is divine, having been committed to the Apostles by the Holy Ghost. If authorities are used in *this* way, anything may be proved or disproved with equal ease.

Bonner (of London) replied:

"I think the Bishops were first, and yet I think it is not of importance, whether the Priest then made the Bishop, or else the Bishop the Priest; considering (after the sentence of St. Jerome) that in the beginning of the Church there was none (or if it were, very small) difference between a Bishop and a Priest, especially touching the signification."

All the replies to this question are of so nearly the

same character, that it is entirely unnecessary to specify more of them.

Question 11:

'Whether a Bishop hath authority to make a Priest by the Scripture or no? And whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest?"

As this is the chief question of all, we will give the substance of the replies of all.

Lee (of York): "That a Bishop may make a Priest may be deduced of Scripture; for so much as *they have all authority necessary for the ordering of Christ's Church derived from the Apostles* * * * * * and that any other than Bishops or Priests may make a Priest we neither find in Scripture nor out of Scripture."

Mr. Goode has also quoted this answer, but has prudently omitted the words in italics!

Bonner (of London) says: "A Bishop duly appointed hath authority by Scripture to make a Bishop and also a Priest."

Heathe (of Rochester): "The Scripture showeth by example that a Bishop hath authority to make a Priest; albeit no Bishop being subject to a Christian prince may either give orders, or excommunicate, or use any manner of jurisdiction, or any part of his authority *without commission from the king*, who is supreme head of that Church whereof he is member. *But that any other man may do it besides a Bishop I find no example either in Scripture or in doctors.*"

Aldrich (of Carlisle): "*A Bishop by Scripture may make Deacons and Priests, and we have none example otherwise!*"

Tunstal (of Durham) or Gardiner (of Winchester), (it is not known which, as the paper is not signed): "*Scripture warranteth a Bishop* (obeying high powers, as his prince christianed) *to order a Priest by imposition of hands and prayer. Of others Scripture speaketh not.*"

Thirleby (of Westminster): "A Bishop having authority of his Christian prince to give Orders, may, by *his ministry given to him of God in Scripture*, ordain a Priest. And *we read not that any other not being a Bishop hath since the beginning of Christ's Church ordered a Priest.*"

Dr. Cox: "Bishops have authority *of the Apostles* to make Priests; except in case of *great necessity.*"

Dr. Day: "Bishops have authority by Scripture to ordain Bishops and Priests.

Dr. Oglethorpe: "Authority to ordain is given to Bishops by the Word."

Dr. Redmayne: "As for making, that is to say, ordaining and consecrating of Priests, I think *it specially belongeth to the office of a Bishop, as far as can be showed by Scripture,* or any example, as I suppose, from the beginning."

Dr. Edgeworth: "A Bishop hath authority by Scripture to make a Priest, and *that any other ever made a Priest since Christ's time I read not.* Albeit, Moses who was not nominated Priest made Aaron Priest and Bishop by a *special commission or revelation from God, without which he would never so have done.*"

Dr. Symmons: "A Bishop placed by the higher powers, and admitted to minister, may make a Priest; and I have not read of *any other that ever made Priests.*"

Dr. Tresham: "I say a Bishop hath authority *by Scripture* to make a Priest, and *other than a Bishop hath* NOT *power therein,* but only in case of necessity."

Dr. Leighton: "I suppose that a Bishop hath *authority from God,* as his minister by Scripture, to make a Priest; but he ought not to admit any man to be Priest and consecrate him, or to appoint him unto any ministry in the Church without the prince's license and consent in a Christian region. And *that any other man hath authority to make a Priest by Scripture, I have not read, nor any example thereof.*"

Dr. Corwen: "A Bishop being licensed by his prince and supreme governer hath authority to make a Priest *by the law of God. I do not read that any Priest hath been ordered by any other than a Bishop!*"

Dr. Robertson says, that the Bishop *has* power to ordain, but should exercise it by permission of the chief magistrate. Whether any other has such power he knows not: has never read that it was done by any other.

The full and fair sense of the entire commission, except Cranmer, is here set forth; and the reader can now judge whether our assertion as to the doctrine of these documents is not correct in every particular. We find a parity of "Order" acknowledged and yet associated with it, Episcopacy by divine right, and the power of ordination *exclusively* belonging to the Bishop.

This is the theory maintained in the three Pre-Reformation documents, and yet the Rev. Mr. Goode

has the courage to assert that their doctrine is the "very" one on which Presbyterians ground their claim to ordain ministers! Either the Reverend gentleman never took the trouble to read the whole of the papers he quotes and writes about so confidently, or else by the most singular fatality he failed to perceive more than half their meaning, and even that half he has not succeeded in setting forth fairly and distinctly.

Before passing on, we beg the reader to contrast the answers above given with that surprising statement made by our author on page 29.

"Not one ventures to determine definitively that the power of ordination belongs exclusively to Bishops."

Here as usual we find a loophole — "determine *definitively!*" And so those answers are regarded as of no account in which the respondents say "they have *never read* that any but a Bishop could ordain!" The phrase italicized is simply equivalent to this, "We never *heard* of such a thing! We never saw the least evidence for it!" But Mr. Goode puts in an "only," and tries to represent it as something like an admission that Priests also might ordain!

Let it be borne in mind that the divines were not asked to "determine definitively," but to say whether "*by the Scripture*" a Bishop hath authority to ordain, and "whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest or no?" To this query what negative could be more direct than those of the Bishops of Durham, Carlisle and Rochester, Dr. Corwen, Dr. Leighton, etc. But let us ask if "definitive" determination is necessary to show the judgment of these divines upon ordination by Presbyters, why Mr. Goode has not

quoted even *one* such determination in favor of it? If his theory be correct, if those men held as he states to the identity of Order of the Bishop and the Priest, why should they hesitate to say that the one could do of right whatever the other could do? But no man ventures so to say. The inference is plain.

Henceforth then we hope to hear less about Presbyterian "parity" being the prevailing doctrine at "the very dawn of the Reformation."

Having disposed of the author's statement to that effect, we subjoin for the reader's benefit an extract which, coming from so strong a Low Church leader as Bishop Burnet, is very appropriate, and should have unusual force.

"On this [the matter of *parity* between Bishops and Priests] I have insisted the more that it may appear *how little they have considered things, who are so far carried with their zeal against the established government of this Church* as to make much use of some passages of the schoolmen and canonists that deny them to be *distinct offices*. For *these are the very dregs of Popery.*" "*So partial are some men to their particular conceits that they make use of the most mischievous topics if they can serve their turn*, not thinking how much farther the arguments will run if they ever admit them."—(*History*, Vol. i., p. 263.)

Cranmer.—The case of the great Archbishop deserves and requires separate consideration on account as well of the importance justly attached to his views, as of the peculiar circumstances under which he drew up his answers to the King's questions.

As the principal person engaged in the commission for compiling the "Institution," Cranmer of course held in 1537 the doctrines it contains as to parity of "Order" and Episcopal Ordination. During the next year he asserted the same views, the latter more especially. He was the principal person

employed in the negotiations with the German divines sent over A. D. 1538, and the papers presented to them as a basis of union were drawn up by his own hand. In them he writes thus:

"The Scripture openly teaches that the order and ministry of Priests and Bishops were instituted *by divine and not human authority*, that their power, function and administration *are necessary to the Church* so long as here on earth we contend with the flesh, the world and the devil, *nor ought they* [the Orders mentioned] *to be on any account abolished;* that Christ gave the power or office of administering the word and sacraments of God to his own Apostles, and in and through them delivered the same not promiscuously to all but only to certain men, namely Bishops and Presbyters, who are properly admitted to the office."

And in another paragraph he says that candidates for the ministry should be presented to the Bishop, that they may receive charge in the Church. (*Cranmer's Letters and Remains, Parker Soc'y*, pp. 484–5.)

The article ("de ordine et ministerio sacerdotum et episcoporum") in which these passages occur was one of those rejected by the Lutherans, and that, as we are told, because it taught the *divine right* of the Episcopate, while they, having only a system of superintendency or humanly authorized Episcopacy, felt that they would be condemned thereby. The fact of their rejecting it then establishes the other fact, that Cranmer held higher views of the nature and office of the Bishop in 1538 than the German divines who accepted an Episcopacy *non jure divino*.

Now is it not entirely out of the common course of nature that opinions which a man has held all his life, opinions avowedly based upon plain Scriptural foundation and supported by irrefragable testimony from ecclesiastical history, should in so very short a

period as less than two years, without any study that we know of, or the offering of any new fact or reason in justification of such a change, be completely abandoned? It certainly is. And yet in 1540 Cranmer answered the King's questions just as a man who wished to destroy belief in a divinely instituted ministry would write. So strange a falling off needs explanation, and this we now present.

We have already mentioned Henry's desire to be the only and the absolute source and holder of power, temporal and spiritual, within his dominions. He was continually making known his desires in this respect, and Cranmer knew them well. Henry would willingly enough defend his Bishops against the Pope, or against any presumptuous Presbyter that might arise to oppose them, but yet he could not brook patiently their claim to divine right inherent in their office. He opposed it not because he loved Episcopacy less, but because he loved his own royal authority more. When the Bishops in the "Institution" said that the power and authority of teaching, ministering and ruling in the Church had been given by Christ himself only to certain men whom they set apart for that holy and important work, Henry's comment was: "*Note*, that there were no kings Christian under whom they did dwell." And when (subsequently) Redmayne and Thirleby pointed out the difference between "making" a Priest or a Bishop, in the sense of electing or appointing, and in the sense of ordaining and consecrating, the King would not grant such a distinction, but argued that as the Apostles if they had had Christian Kings would have left (as he supposed) the appointment of the Bishops

to them, so they might have left the consecration also.

"Now sins yow confesse that the apostyllys did occupate the won part, which now yow confesse *belongeth to princes*, how can you prove that ordeyning is wonly committed to yow bysshopes?"

The spirit of this inquiry is that of the entire paper submitted to the commission. The second clause in the 11th question, viz: "whether any other but only a Bishop may make a Priest," was not meant of Presbyters, but of Kings. Some of the other inquiries betray the object of them still more plainly.

Now of all who replied to these queries only one man gave in every instance the answer desired by Henry, and that man was the Archbishop Thomas Cramner.

His reply to the ninth question (given above) was:

"All Christian princes have committed unto them, immediately of God, the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance." "The ministers of God's word *under his Majesty* be the Bishops, Parsons, Vicars, and such other Priests as be appointed *by his Highness* to that ministration; as, for example, the Bishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Duresme, the Bishop of Winchester, the Parson of Winwick, etc. All the said officers and ministers, as well of the one sort as of the other, be appointed, assigned, and elected in every place by the laws and orders of KINGS and PRINCES."

To this he adds that Christian people in the Apostolic age, having no King, "were *constrained of necessity* to take such curates and priests as they knew themselves to be meet thereunto, or else as were *commended* unto them" by the Apostles!

To the tenth question (given above) he answers:

"The Bishops and Priests were at one time and were not two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion."

To the eleventh question (given above) he answers:

"A Bishop may make a Priest by the Scripture, and *so may princes and governors also*, and the people also by their election."

Twelfth question:

"Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a Bishop and Priest, or *only appointing to the office be sufficient?*"

Answer:

"In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a Bishop or Priest *needeth no consecration* by the Scripture; for *election or appointing thereto is sufficient!*"

Thirteenth question:

"Whether (if it befortuned a Prince Christian-learned to conquer certain dominions of infidels, having none but temporal-learned men with him) it be defended by God's law, that he and they should preach and teach the word of God there, or no? and also *make and constitute Priests or no?*"

Answer:

"It is not against God's law, but contrary, *they ought indeed so to do,*" etc., etc.

Fourteenth question:

"Whether it be forfended by God's law that (if it so fortuned that all the Bishops and Priests of a region were dead, and that the word of God should remain there unpreached, the sacrament of Baptism and others unministered, that the KING of that region should *make Bishops and Priests* to supply the same, or no?"

Answer:

"It is not forbidden by God's law."

There will be no difficulty in perceiving how entirely at variance these views are with those previously avowed by the Archbishop, and also how far apart from the teachings of our Church. They are toned to suit the King; and the secret is this—they were written in the shadow of the scaffold!

The cause of Reformation had that very year met its greatest check. Lord Cromwell, the great friend of Cranmer and favorer of the Gospel, was, on a false pretence, put to death by the public executioner. In his fall the Papists—whose hopes were by it revived—supposed they saw a presage of Cranmer's fall, and all their energies were then, and for four years afterward, bent to the task of sending the Archbishop after the statesman. The notorious "Act of Six Articles" became law in spite of the Primate's influence, and as this "terrible, bloody" enactment made it treason and heresy, punishable with burning to death, and forfeiture of all the individual's goods to the crown, to say a word against transubstantiation, or treason and felony for a priest to have a wife, the poor Archbishop was obliged to "betake himself to retirement and greater privacy," and to dismiss his wife, who was the niece of Osiander, the German Reformer. Latimer and Shaxton could not conscientiously retain their bishopricks, so they resigned, and were cast into prison; and while they and over five hundred others were in the common jails as violators of the new law, the Archbishop, the head and front of the reforming party, standing almost alone, deserted by friends, and appearing to live merely by the sufferance of a cruel and capricious tyrant, had the questions put to him as already stated. He took counsel of his fears, and replied as Henry wished, which he could do the more easily, as he always had been the strongest supporter of the divine right of kings.

The ready and flippant reply to this will be, that we accuse the good Bishop of gross unfaithfulness.

But not so; far be it from us to *accuse* him. We know, *unhappily* too well, that he was not insensible to fear when danger of death, in its most dreadful form, threatened him; and while we glorify God for the strength given, by which he was made at last willing to accept and able to endure the torturing flame, we, with himself, mourn over "the unworthy hand" which signed the recantation. The previous yielding was surely much less criminal than recanting altogether; and if timidity could induce the performance of the greater defection, it could also of the less.

We have evidence that in the year (1540) now under consideration the Archbishop did, in another very important matter, yield completely to the King. Henry was tired of Anne of Cleves, and wanted her removed. The Romish party heartily wished her out of the way. The question of divorce was sent to Parliament and Convocation; it was vigorously pressed by all enemies to Church reform, and Cranmer gave his full consent to it among the rest. Bishop Burnet thus records the fact:

"*Cranmer*, whether overcome with these arguments, or *rather with fear, for he knew it was contrived to send him quickly after Cromwell, consented with the rest.* So that the whole Convocation with one disagreeing vote judged the marriage null and of no force, and that both the King and the Lady were free from the bond of it. *This was the greatest piece of compliance that ever the king had from the clergy.*"

The same causes which forced Cranmer to yield to Henry in the one matter were in operation, and led to his yielding in the other. But, in stating this fact in explanation of the extraordinary opinions avowed in the answers given above, we by no means wish to strip one leaf of laurel from the brow of him whom

in our heart of hearts we honor and love beyond any other uninspired man that ever trod our earth. Were he free from such infirmities as these facts in his history reveal, he would have been not man but angel. But, *with* these infirmities he is still the best of men, and the greatest of all Reformers; the wisest, the most patient and painstaking, the most conscientious, the most learned, the most modest and God-fearing man of them all. And when we think of the characters of those who are often spoken of as his superiors, and who died at ease in their beds, while he at the stake witnessed his good confession for Christ, we feel that the world has not yet opened its eyes to the excellence of the great Bishop who, under God, was the Father of England's Reformed Church.

But let us see what he himself thought his duty to be when the King's cause or opinion might be different from his. Writing to Cromwell in the year 1535, in reference to Gardiner's attempt to excite Henry against him for styling himself as usual, "Primate of all England," he said Gardiner took such a course as made him appear not to "maintain his own cause but the King's; *against whose highness I will maintain no cause, but give place, and lay both my cause and myself at the Prince's feet.*" This was written when his star was in the ascendant; how much more likely was such compliance when the headsman's axe and the flaming faggot were ready to cut him off. Such, then, were the circumstances under which the poor Bishop wrote his replies, and appended to them this striking sentence:

"*This is mine opinion and sentence at this present,* which,

nevertheless, I do not temerariously define, but refer the judgment thereof *wholly unto your majesty.* T. CANTUARIEN."

Is it not strange that opinions so entirely different from the previous and later views of the writer, so modestly put forth, and left after all to be set aside by the King if he desired it, should, without one word of explanation, be quoted, and that, too, by a Church clergyman, as the settled doctrine of the great Archbishop? Yet Mr. Goode so quotes them, and leaves his readers under the impression that Cranmer never held any other. Burnet, in whose History he found the document, tells us plainly that Cranmer's answers contained

"Some *singular opinions* of his about the nature of ecclesiastical offices * * but as they were *delivered by him with all possible modesty,* so they were not established as the doctrine of the Church, but laid aside as *particular conceits of his own,* as it seems that *afterwards he changed his opinion.*"

But as such change would not favor the theory of Mr. Goode, his readers are left to suppose it never took place. We shall see.

In 1543, the King employed the Archbishop in compiling the "Necessary Erudition." His attempt in 1540 had convinced him that the Church would not give up even to the King those powers which it held of Divine right; therefore he contented himself with strong statements of his supreme authority, and the duty of all subjects (lay and clerical) to their prince, and with putting to death those who denied the one or omitted the other. As regards the polity, then, the doctrine of the "Erudition" was allowed to remain to all intents and purposes the same as that of the "Institution," published seven years before. Here, then, we see the return of the Archbishop to a

better mind already. During the next year he so far prevailed with the King as to have the severity of the "Six Articles," relaxed, and leave given for the use of a Litany in English, but all further attempts at reformation were steadily repressed.

We have no other writing by Cranmer, during Henry's life, from which his views on the point before us can be collected. But in the very first year of Edward VI., when he was at the head of affairs, and fully free to act, we find him publishing a sermon which we will refer to again, and in which the doctrine of Apostolical Succession is strongly maintained. He issued it, in connection with that known as Cranmer's Catechism (which is in reality a translation from a German one, of which Justus Jonas had made a Latin version); in this work the "Apostolical descent, Episcopal ordination, and the power of the Keys, are strongly enforced and greatly enlarged upon," (see Oxford ed., 1829, page 123, etc.)

Bishop Burnet gives the same account of this book, and says of Cranmer:

"It is plain that he had *now quite laid aside those singular opinions which he formerly held of the ecclesiastical functions;* for now, in a work which was wholly his own, without the concurrence of any others, *he fully sets forth their Divine Institution.*

In a fragment on "unwritten varieties" composed in 1548, the Archbishop says:

"In the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost descended upon the Apostles and disciples of Christ, they received such grace and ghostly knowledge that they had forthwith the gift of the understanding of Scripture to speak in the tongue of all men, and also that upon whomsoever they laid their hands the Holy Ghost should descend upon them."

He then goes on to mention the writing of the Gospel and of the Apostolic Epistles, and their acceptation by the Church as inspired writings, and adds:

"It was authorized that when the people that were newly converted to the faith were full of grace and of devotion, replenished with virtues, desiring always the life to come, and the health of their own souls and of their neighbors. *Then also were* BLESSED BISHOPS, BLESSED PRIESTS *and* OTHER BLESSED PERSONS OF THE CLERGY, and what could such men ask of God right wisely, that should be denied them?"

In this (and other still more important writings yet to be mentioned) the Archbishop abandons his theory of two Orders, and the "parity" attached to it. He names three Orders at least, as existing in the golden prime of the Apostolic Church. Had he in the meantime (that is since 1540) been employed in any research which would extend his knowledge or correct his mistaken notions upon those subjects? Yes! He had set himself to another careful rereading of Scripture and of all the Fathers (with a view to discovering the true and primitive doctrine of the Sacraments), and from these two sources he found that the Romish doctrine of the Lord's Supper was a heresy and novelty, and *pari passu* he discovered that an Episcopate degraded by a presumptuous overvaluing of the priesthood, and by the arrogant assumption of a Pope, had no resemblance to the Episcopate of Primitive and Apostolic Christianity. He saw that man had dishonored what God had instituted by his chosen servants, and that it was the duty of those who would reform the Church to redress this wrong also. Consequently in 1548–9, 1551–2 when the great and good man was drawing up our formularies in their first shape, he, with his

own hand, wrote the sentence where, again and again, the ministers of Christ are classed in their separate Orders; and in the preface to the Ordinal, he, Archbishop Cranmer, wrote that it is

"*Evident unto all men diligently reading* HOLY SCRIPTURES and *ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there have been these* ORDERS of *ministers in Christ's Church:* BISHOPS, PRIESTS, and DEACONS."

The reader of Mr. Goode's pamphlet, if he had no other guide, would know but little of these facts, and taking the Reverend gentleman's account of Cranmer for a true and full representation, would naturally enough suppose that the chief founder of our Church was really and always an Erastian who cared little or nothing how it was constituted.

The truth is here made known, and thus we learn that he who was the principal framer of our standards, was a believer in the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, and ordination exclusively by Bishops.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FORMULARIES.

WE come now to examine the first class of our Standards with a view to discover the Church's doctrine on Episcopacy, and her judgment of what constitutes lawful ordination to the Christian ministry.

Mr. Goode's theory (so far as it can be collected from his pamphlet) is, that the Church does *not* hold the divine institution of a threefold ministry, that she looks upon Bishops and Priests as one in ORDER though differing in *office*; and he insinuates that whereinsoever the office of a Bishop differs from that of a Priest it is by man's will and arrangement, and not God's; consequently the Bishop has by divine right no separate standing and no peculiar privileges, and the imposition of his hands is not necessary to constitute a lawful ordination.

We differ from the Reverend gentleman *toto cœlo*. We maintain that the Church holds the divine institution of a ministry consisting of three separate and distinct Orders, that she gives no sanction whatever to the Romish notion of a parity in "Order" between Bishops and Priests, and that she gives to the Bishop, and to him *exclusively*, the right of ordaining ministers in the Church of Christ.

At the time of our Protestant Church's first establishment, there were in the Roman Church, whose doctrine and rule she cast off, great numbers of ecclesiastics of different (so called) "Orders" and degrees, viz: "Ostiarii," "Lectores," "Exorcists," "Acolyths" "Sub-Deacons," "Deacons," "Priests," "Bishops," "Archbishops," and "Pope," to say nothing of Friars and Monks, Abbots, Cardinals, etc., etc.

Now as the English divines in reorganizing their ecclesiastical affairs went on the principle of following implicitly the Word of God, and the practice of primitive Christians, we take it for granted that the ministerial Orders she preserved would be those for which she saw full warrant in Holy Scripture and the Apostolic Church, and those which she did not preserve would be rejected as unscriptural and merely of human origin. The first five of the Romish Orders and some of the others were neither preserved nor mentioned by her, and thus sufficiently repudiated.

But in addition to Bishops, Priests and Deacons, she preserved the office of Archbishop and Archdeacon and those connected with her Cathedral establishments, viz.: Deans, Canons, Prebendaries, etc., and the question now arises whether her doing so does not stamp them as in her estimation all equally and alike divine as to their origin? To this we answer emphatically, No! She preserves the last named offices as allowable and convenient for her, but the broad distinction which she herself makes between them and the three Apostolic Orders shows that while she claims nothing for them but allowance, she regards the others as divine.

Such a "parity" in order with difference in "office" as Mr. Goode argues for in the case of the Bishop and the Priest, the Church recognizes as existing between the Archbishop and the Bishop. But if his theory were correct, the Bishop would occupy in our formularies no more prominent position, and have claimed for his office no higher warrant than is now claimed in them for the Archbishop. Let us see, then, how the facts are.

In the preface to the (English) Prayer Book we find three classes of ministers mentioned, and these are "Bishops," "Priests," and "Deacons." The "Archbishop" is once mentioned as ultimate referee in doubtful cases, but not as belonging to any superior order of ministers.

In the daily morning and evening service, prayers are offered up for the "Bishops and Curates," or persons having cure of souls.*

In the Litany there is a special petition for all "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," no others of any office or degree being mentioned.

In the first of the two collects for Ember-days, the Almighty is asked to guide the minds of His

"Servants the Bishops and pastors of his flock, that THEY may lay hands suddenly on no man, but faithfully and wisely make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of the Church."

In the other collect for same season, God is addressed as the

"Giver of all good gifts, *who of his Divine Providence hath appointed* DIVERS ORDERS *in his Church.*"

* "Our Bishops and other clergy."—(*American Book of Common Prayer.*)

"Divers" Orders must be not only more than one, but more than two. The phrase would apply to five or to fifty, but it clearly means more than two, and the precise number which the Church regards as thus divinely instituted is fixed by her frequent references, as above shown, to three such Orders, and three only. In fact, we meet continually, throughout the whole Liturgy and Offices, with Bishop, Priest, and Deacon (the titles Curate or Minister being occasionally applied to the Priest or the Deacon), but we meet with no fourth Order, and not the slightest intimation of parity between any two of the three which the Church thus specifies as those ordained by God.

We now proceed to the Articles. The Twenty-third reads thus:

"It is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same; and those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them *in the congregation* to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard."

Upon this Article Mr. Goode comments thus:

"It must be observed how carefully this is worded, so as not to limit a lawful ministry to those who have Episcopal ordination, and it is hardly possible for one acquainted with the circumstances of the times in which it was written, to read it and not see that this carefulness was for the very purpose of not excluding the ministry of the Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches."

We have taken some pains to make ourselves well acquainted with the circumstances of the time referred to, and yet fail utterly to perceive any such "carefulness not to exclude," or any notice of, or any regard to any body or Church on earth, other than that general Church of Christ mentioned in the Article.

If Mr. Goode would himself consider the origin of the Article, he would probably understand it differently. We find it, or the germ of it, forming one of the series of Articles* referred to in the last chapter as having been drawn up by Cranmer and submitted to the German divines who were sent to England, in 1538, with a view to effecting a union between the English and Lutheran Churches. Some of those Articles were rejected by the Germans, and the whole scheme was abandoned, because [among other reasons] the English Primate, and other Bishops, had set forth as divine, and therefore necessary in a Church, the three Orders of the Christian Ministry. This being so, it is perfectly absurd to say that one part of the series shows a "carefulness not to exclude" those who felt themselves excluded by another part! And so precisely with the Article in its present form and position. We do not quote it as establishing Episcopacy, but Mr. Goode quotes it as *not* doing so, and as exhibiting some extraordinary

---

* The following is the Article "de ministris Ecclesiæ," A. D. 1538. The reader will see that its first sentence is almost identical with the Twenty-third Article, as written by the same author, Thomas Cranmer, in 1549.

"De ministris ecclesiæ docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, sacramenta ministrare, nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in Ecclesia juxta verbum Dei, et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi, et admittendi. Et quod nullus ad ecclesiæ ministerium vocatus etiamsi episcopus sit, sive Romanus sive quicunque alius, hoc sibi jure divino vindicare possit, ut publice docere sacramenta ministrare, vel ullam aliam ecclesiasticam functionem in aliena diocesi aut parochia exercere valeat: hoc est nec episcopus in alterius episcopi diocesi, nec parochus in alterius parochia. Et demum quod malitia ministri efficaciæ sacramentorum nihil detrahat, ut jam supra docuimus in articulo de ecclesia."—(*Cranmer's Remains, Parker Society*, p. 477.)

We desire no stronger acknowledgment of the divine right of Bishops than is contained in this very Article, the first sentence of which, or its equivalent, is supposed to have been "carefully worded" so as not to exclude those who reject Bishops!

carefulness "not to exclude" Presbyterians. We reply, it takes no notice of them, any more than of Whigs or Tories, Mormons or Shakers.* It exhibits no such carefulness at all. It simply declares the general truth, that no one should presume to act as a Christian Minister until he had first been lawfully called and sent by those possessing, in the Church of Christ, the power to send laborers into the Lord's vineyard. It does not specify who those lawful ordainers are, for that is not the object of the Article. But if we find anywhere else in our standards such doctrine held, or such practice enjoined as does exclude Non-Episcopalians, what becomes of the notion that the Article was "carefully worded" for the very opposite purpose?†

We now invite the attention of the reader to the word "*congregation*" italicized in the latter part of the Article as quoted above. The italics are Mr. Goode's: Why has he emphasized the word?

Those accustomed to the phraseology of the present

---

* The author hopes that no one will represent him as speaking disrespectfully or unkindly here. He only means to show that Presbyterians are not at all referred to.

† Authoritative interpretation of the formularies can only be given by the Church as a body, or by the very persons who were concerned in drawing up the formularies. Next to Cranmer, the most important person in the framing of our devotional and doctrinal standards was Bishop Ridley, one of the most learned men of his age, and an illustrious member of the "noble army of Martyrs." His exposition of the first standards would, of course, be "authoritative." Can we find, then, anything from his pen that will help us to an understanding of this Twenty-third Article? We believe so. In his primary Visitation of the Diocese of London, he asks after "*any of the Anabaptists' sect or other*" which [not having regular or Episcopal ordination] "use notoriously any *unlawful* or private *conventicles* wherein they do *use doctrine or administration of Sacraments*": and he orders that "no persons *use to minister the Sacraments*, or in open *audience of the congregation, presume to expound the Holy Scriptures or to preach* before they be first *lawfully called and authorized in that behalf*."—(See *Cardwell's Doc. Annals*, Vol. i., p. 91; *Ridley's Works, Parker Soc.*, p. 321.)

age, and aware of the usage in what are called "Congregational Churches" would be likely, if not put upon their guard, to suppose that the Article permitted ordination by persons (even laymen) chosen in each worshipping assembly or "congregation." Mr. Goode, as if he were afraid that his readers would not fall into this gross error italicizes the word and thus suggests it. As a result of his so doing, we have ourselves heard it asserted on his authority, that the Article really warrants congregational ordination!

What does the word mean as it stands in the Article? Cranmer himself, in the 19th, declares the Church of Christ to be a "Congregation of faithful men." In his other writings he uses the word in the same sense; as when he says the Pope did not receive "power to destroy but to edify the "Congregation." Thomas Becon, his contemporary and one of his chaplains, uses it often, as in sending forth his works that they might "glorify God and profit his holy Congregation." So also Bishop Bale (who died in 1563) mentions "the holy temple of God, which is his Congregation or Church," and again "the Congregation or Kingdom of God in which Congregation He shall reign forever." References of this character might be multiplied indefinitely, but these are amply sufficient to explain the meaning of the word at the time the Article was written.

But if Mr. Goode were ignorant of this meaning or use of the word he is still without excuse, inasmuch as the Latin Articles are before his eye, and in the one under notice the corresponding word is *Ecclesia*—the Church, i. e. the universal Church of Christ.

And *apropos* of this we would add that the Rever-

end gentlemen occasionally gives another signification to *Ecclesia* in this same Article. Even when criticizing the reading of an opponent and blaming him for not giving the words precisely as they are printed, he has the hardihood to write thus:

"The Article clearly implies, that there is power in *a church* to authorize certain of its members to call and appoint others to the office of the ministry which exactly meets the case of the Foreign Protestant Churches."

Here to "meet the case" of Non-Episcopalians, Mr. Goode turns THE Church into *a* church, and so in the same Article he gives three different significations to *Ecclesia*.* On such a system it would not be difficult to make our standards teach any scheme of doctrine that the most ingenious could devise.

But again, our author says—

"It is quite clear that the words of this Article do not maintain the necessity of Episcopal ordination, and consequently as the object of the article is to show the doctrine of the Church of England on the subject, it cannot be said that the Church of England maintains it." (Page 16.)

The conclusion would be as he thus states it if only his premises were correct. We deny them both. (1) We hold that by those "who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation" or Catholic Church of Christ, the writers meant simply Bishops, and therefore just as far as the Article maintains the necessity of any ordination it maintains the necessity of Episcopal ordination. But (2) where do we find his authority for saying that "the object of this Article is to show the doctrine of the 'Church of England' on 'the necessity [or non-neces-

* In this matter he has followed Archbishop Whately. See his "Kingdom of Christ," N. Y. edition, p. 157.

sity] of Episcopal ordination?'" What is the title or heading of it? Is it "Of Ordination?" No! But "Of Ministering in the Congregation." What ground then does this or the general purport of the Article give for the assertion that its object was to define the doctrine of the Church upon the subject now discussed? The Reverend author goes farther still. He not only implies that in this Article alone are we to find the Church's doctrine of Ordination, but in the succeeding paragraph he affirms it, thus: "This is the *only* place in which our Church touches upon the question of ordination, *in the abstract.*" These last three words are thrown in as a saving clause. Nevertheless, the sentence, as it stands, contains a manifest error; for if the Reverend gentleman's own interpretation of the Preface to the Ordinal be taken *it* certainly contains some allusion to ordination *in the abstract.*

But what have we to do with "ordination *in the abstract?*" We are not now discussing whether it is a sacrament conferring grace or not—nor whether it gives an indelible character—nor even whether there must be in every case the *impositio manuum?* The question is simply whether our Church gives the right of ordaining exclusively to Bishops,—whether she directly or indirectly acknowledges that ordination can be lawfully performed by any other than a Bishop? Does the Reverend gentleman mean then to tell his readers that the 23d is the only Article [or "place"] in which our Church touches upon *this* subject? The reader has but to turn to the 36th Article and there see what the Church does really say upon Ordination. Its title is "Of Consecration of

Bishops and Ministers," and that of itself suffices. The assertion of the Reverend gentleman is without foundation, and so his conclusion is rejected.

The reader will observe further, that our author is not willing to adhere to the mode of interpreting the standards which he has himself laid down; viz.: That they are to be taken in their plain literal sense; and if any doubt exist as to their meaning, reference is to be made to the other writings of the "men who drew them up." If this rule be fair and sufficient, why, we ask, does Mr. Goode, as soon as he has given us his own comment go (*not* to the writings of Cranmer, Ridley and their associates, but) to what he is pleased to call an "authentic interpretation" penned about fifty-three years after the Article? And as if even that were not enough, he proceeds to quote Bishop Burnet and Professor Hey! Were these among the framers of our formularies? We do not stop to consider their opinions *pro* or *con*, but simply rule them out as not called for, nor at all admissible on Mr. Goode's own showing. Among the mere opinions of other individuals at the end of the pamphlet they would be rightly placed.

Let us now prosecute our search for information as to those who in our Church's estimation are truly authorized ordainers in the Church of God.

The 32d Article mentions the ministry as consisting of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. To one or more of those the right must belong.

The 36th Article endorses and ratifies a book commonly known as the Ordinal, stating that it contains all things necessary to the ordination or consecration of the several grades of ministers, and that it

hath in it nothing superstitious or ungodly. Thus, the Ordinal (in itself a Standard) becomes in an especial sense authoritative, just as the book of Homilies, which is, in the same manner, endorsed in the 35th Article.

To the Ordinal, then, we go; and what do we find? *That Bishops are in every case the ordainers!* The Deacon is to be set apart to his office by the Bishop alone; the Priest by the Bishop, assisted in the laying on of hands by the other Priests present; and the Bishop by Bishops only—the Archbishop being of course one of the same Order, and receiving no different consecration or ordination.

Such, then, is the Church's deliberate judgment of the matter. We ask, is there a shadow of probability that if she regarded ordination performed by Presbyters or Deacons as lawful and valid, she would, without hinting any such thing, make a positive rule by which she placed the authority to ordain solely and forever in the hands of the Bishop.

What is her judgment as to the Bishop and Priest? Are they only different in the degree of temporal authority and dignity they possess, but still of one Order? Let us see. We find the diaconate, the priesthood, and the episcopate are all equally called "offices," and "Orders;" so that in this respect the Church knows no difference between these terms. As Mr. Goode suggests, however, that the word "Order" is used in some "large and general sense," we will trace the matter. We find in the form for ordaining Deacons, the Collect commencing

"Almighty God, who by thy divine providence hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church, and didst

inspire thine Apostles to choose into the Order of Deacons the first martyr, St. Stephen, with others, mercifully behold these thy servants now called to the like Office and administration."

And when the Bishop lays on his hands, he says,

"Take thou authority to execute the *Office* of a Deacon," etc., etc.

In the form for ordaining Priests we find a precisely similar course pursued, except that the word Order is even less used than in the former case.

We have the Collect:

"Almighty God, giver of all good things, who by thy Holy Spirit hath appointed divers Orders of Ministers in the Church, mercifully behold these thy servants now called to the *Office* of Priesthood," etc., etc.

And at the laying on of hands the Bishop says,

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the *Office* and work of a Priest," etc., etc.

Passing on now to the form for Bishops, we find the same Collect, thus,

"Almighty God, giver of all good things, who by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church, mercifully behold this thy servant now called to the work and Ministry of a Bishop," etc., etc.

And at the laying on of hands the sentence is,

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God," etc., etc.

Thus, the same course is pursued with all; each of the three is referred to as an "Order," instituted in the Church by the Holy Ghost, each is also styled an "office" and ministration; therefore, all are distinct. There is for each a distinct service, in which the person ordained is instructed and pledged with reference to the special duties of the Order or Office to which he is about to be admitted, and he who reads

over the charges given in each particular case will see clearly that, however sophistical pleaders may attempt to identify one with the other, the Church makes them fully that which she declares God himself made them—three separate Orders of ministers.

The Deacon is pledged to assist the Priest in divine service, and especially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, etc., etc.; he is also reverently to obey his ordinary and other chief ministers, and them to whom the charge and governance over him is committed.

The Priest is pledged to preach the true doctrine of the Word of God, to minister the Holy Sacraments, to drive away errors, to maintain discipline in his own Church, and to be obedient to his Bishop, as in the case of the Deacon.

The Bishop is pledged, like the Priest, to teach true doctrine, and drive away false, and to be as far as possible a setter-forth and ensample of righteousness and godliness, and especially a maintainer of gentleness and peace. In addition to this, he is to punish, according to such authority as he has *by God's Word*, and the laws of the realm, such as are disorderly or "criminous" within his diocese; and, lastly, he is to be *faithful in* ORDAINING, *sending, and laying hands upon others!*

This, we think, effectually disposes of the "parity" theory. It is a tenet which the Church of England rejects, and which is held only by her enemies.

Our Author, as one reason for supposing that the Church does not truly consider the Episcopate a distinct "Order," says, on page 29:

"We find that the Services *never* apply the word *order* or *or-*

dering to the making of Bishops, but only in the case of Deacons and Priests, and speak of the *consecration* of Bishops."

The Reverend gentleman must have a very defective copy of the Prayer Book in his possession. We have some three or four various editions before us as we write, and in *all* of them the form by which Bishops are set apart to their sacred office is called the form of "ORDAINING or consecrating!" So it stands in the English Ordinal, so it stands in the American; and yet Mr. Goode says the Services *never* apply the word to the making of a Bishop!*

The Preface to the Ordinal is too important to be passed over. In the English Prayer Book of the present day the first paragraph of it reads thus:

"*It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that, from the Apostles' time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church — Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.* Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that *no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined,* and known

* It did not occur to us until the above was in the printer's hands, that possibly the Author meant the services of 1549, or 1552, and not those of all dates, as we understood him. If so, we grant that there is a measure of truth in his remark. It so happens that *in the title* of the special service we read, *not* "the Ordering" but the "Consecrating of a Bishop." But is the word "Order," as he says, not used at all? Let the Collect, quoted above, answer that question, and prove his inaccuracy.

It strikes us, however, that the Reverend gentleman will not gain anything by making so much of titles. His point, if sustained, would prove too much. The title of the Ordinal, as first published, was, "The Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" consequently no one of the three was to be *ordained!* But a truce to such trifling. It is surely apparent that the words are used in common for the solemn act by which men are set apart to the service of God in the ministry; and, so far as the word "consecration" is applied to the setting apart of a Bishop, it is simply to give it higher honor. No other author, we fancy, would hope to prove that a Bishop is simply a Presbyter by showing that his ordination is called consecration!

Dr. Redmayne, in his replies to the queries of 1540, shows plainly that the words were all used interchangeably. He says: "As for *making*, that is to say, *ordaining* and *consecrating* of Priests, I think it specially belongeth to the office of a Bishop."

to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also *by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority.* And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, *or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.*"

Here then we have, (1st) an assertion that it is EVIDENT from HOLY SCRIPTURE *and ancient authors* that the three Orders of ministers have been in the Church of Christ since the Apostles' time. (2nd) That no one might ever presume to execute any of these offices, except he were first admitted thereto by prayer and the imposition of hands by LAWFUL AUTHORITY, which, coupled with the restriction of the ordaining power to the Bishop in the forms that follow, gives us the Church's decision as to those who have authority to call and send laborers into the Lord's vineyard. (3rd) We have a declaration of dutiful desire to perpetuate the Apostolical Orders, and to that end a law that no man shall be accounted a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, unless he has been ordained according to the form given, or hath previously received Episcopal ordination.

Mr. Goode does not like this "Preface." It is very sure that he would not have written it, for he would not venture to pronounce upon the "diligence" of those who cannot see in Holy Scripture and ancient authors that which the Church declares to be *evident!* And yet, though he likes it so little, the Reverend gentleman will not confess that it destroys his case. He argues that because the Twenty-Third Article

does not positively and *totidem verbis* declare for Episcopacy, it is not against him. Now, when he meets another portion of the Standard, of equal authenticity, which does positively assert Episcopacy, he has yet another turn—*it* cannot be against him, because it does not deal in negatives, or does not explicitly deny the validity of Presbyterian ordination! Such a mode of meeting arguments, or striving to evade the force of authorities, may suit the purposes of a party, but will never aid in ascertaining the doctrine of the Church. As regards doctrines and practices that are opposed to each other, we have yet to learn that the positive announcement or adoption of the one is not of necessity the rejection or condemnation of the other. When our Church admits infants to holy baptism, she thereby repudiates the notions and practices of those called "Baptists," who refuse to admit them. When she teaches the Eternal Sonship and proper Deity of the Lord Jesus Christ, she certainly leaves no room for Arian heresy. And so when, following Scripture and the primitive Church, she places in the hands of her Bishops exclusively the right to ordain, and declares that God hath appointed divers Orders in his Church, she gives no margin and makes no allowance for those who teach that God hath done nothing of the sort, and who have substituted for the Apostolic mode of ordination one by Presbyters, devised by Calvin and others, sixteen hundred years after Christ. The assertion of her own principles is her condemnation of theirs.

We consider this principle, that the adoption of a thing is the repudiation of its opposite, so obvious,

that we are ashamed even to spend a sentence in supporting it; but some make a merit of denying it, and Mr. Goode hopes to secure allowance for his theory, in spite of it. Let us see, then, what is said upon the matter by the learned Dr. Whittaker, the great opponent of the Jesuits Bellarmine and Stapleton. The latter argued that, although the Church did not, or might not, receive all the parts of what he called Scripture, yet she did not reject them. Whittaker replies:

"But, I pray you, what is the difference between *not receiving* and *rejecting?* Absolutely none! He who *does not receive* God *rejects* him; and so the Church plainly *rejected* those Scriptures which formerly it *did not receive.*" — (*Disputations*, A. D. 1588, *Parker Society* ed., page 230.)

On this same principle, then, we hold that our Church, having deliberately adopted Episcopacy as consonant with the word of God and the constitution of the Primitive Church, by so doing sufficiently repudiated Presbyterianism, as *not* warranted by either. So also, in not admitting the right of Presbyters to ordain, she denied that they had such right; in confining it solely to the Bishop, she taught plainly that no other did or could possess it.

But to return to the Ordinal. Our author says, concerning the Preface:

"The first part is the simple statement of a fact, without intent on the part of the authors to pass upon *other forms of government*, but as giving a *sufficient warrant for their own.*"

We cannot for a moment accept so bare and weak an interpretation. The Preface is *not* the "simple statement of a fact," but a confident appeal to Holy Scriptures and to primitive Christian antiquity. It has nothing to do, *pro* or *con*, with any *other forms of*

government, for it knows no others. It announces as always existing in CHRIST'S CHURCH one form, and that one Episcopal. And it does not state this merely as a "*sufficient warrant*" for adopting Episcopacy, but as indicating a rule which the Church feels bound to follow.

As regards the concluding sentence in the portion of the Preface quoted above, the Reverend gentleman says:

> "The second part, 'or hath had Episcopal consecration,' etc., was not added until a hundred years after, that is to say in 1661, by the Laudean party under Charles II."

Here the author wanders from the subject. The inquiry is not "What *did* the Church teach?" but "What *does* she teach, what *are* her doctrine and practice upon the point debated?" This being so, it matters little how or by whom any portion of any formulary was written, so long as it is now really and truly a part of it. But the sentence referred to has been for two hundred years truly and properly a part of the standard, and *is* to-day in full force, and cannot be evaded, either in the actual administration of the Church, or in discussing her principles.

It is a very weak and unworthy way of meeting authoritative declaration to give its authors a "nickname," and so pass the matter by; and it is, to say the least, rather disrespectful for a clergyman so to treat those Bishops and Presbyters who were the last reviewers of his own Liturgy. But the chief objection to this remark of Mr. Goode is that it is entirely without foundation in fact.

The words he specifies *were* put where they now stand at the last revision of the Prayer Book in

1661–2, but the men who placed them there were not a "party," and were not "Laudean." They were the Bishops and Doctors of the Church in Convocation assembled. Their work received the sanction of Parliament and King, and thus became the law of the land as well as the law of the Church. In any little sketch or text-book of English Church history the names of those illustrious divines may be met with, and to any such list we point as a sufficient reply to the charge implied in the name "Laudean." But if a more specific and pointed disproof of that charge be required, we give it in the following words:

"Glad enough, no doubt, would the Laudean party have been *if they could have introduced various alterations into our formularies at this time.* But, *providentially, the power of doing so* WAS NOT IN THEIR HANDS"!

This we print *verbatim* from page 480 (Amer. ed.) of a work on baptism by the Rev. Wm. Goode himself!!

But Laudean or not Laudean, did the Church, in 1661, by putting the sentence "or hath had formerly Episcopal ordination" where it now stands, introduce a new principle? Did it alter its doctrine or its practice? Not a whit! Let the reader but once more throw his eye over the Preface as given above, and consider that the men who drew it up, and all their associates, had been Episcopally ordained in connection with the Church of Rome, and that they and their successors had always received persons *so* ordained as soon as they were satisfied of their orthodoxy, and he will perceive at once that the *spirit* of the paragraph is not changed by the addition.

But that no change, either in spirit, doctrine or practice was effected by it, will be still more evident when we inform the reader that *words of the same meaning as those added in* 1661 *were always to be found in the said Preface previous to that date.* The reviewers simply changed one form of expression for another more correct and appropriate.

The Preface, as written by Cranmer and published in 1549, and republished in the Revised Liturgy of 1552, contained the following sentence:

"And therefore, to the intent these Orders should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (*not being at this present* BISHOP, PRIEST, *nor* DEACON) shall execute any of them except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted according to the form hereafter following."—(*Cranmer's Remains, Parker Society*, p. 519; *Keeling's Liturgiæ Britannicæ*, London, 1851, p. 367; *Cardwell's two Books of Common Prayer Compared*, Oxford, 1852. p. 398.)

The continuation of the phrase "*at this present,*" etc., for a space of one hundred and ten years is itself a wonder. The Convocation of 1661 removed it and substituted the less awkward equivalent, "hath formerly had Episcopal ordination or consecration." This simple fact, which Mr. Goode is careful not to divulge, effectually settles his implied charge of unfair dealing and innovation.

The principles and practice of the Church, as regards the subject before us, have undergone no change whatever. The formularies have, from the very beginning, taught the same doctrine that they teach now, and we shall see presently that the laws and usages have preserved a similar consistency or unity during the whole period of the Church's history.

But something more may be learned as to the real doctrine of the Church from the American Liturgy. Mr. Goode has very properly said that the doctrine of the two Churches is identical, and whatever fixes it for the one fixes it for the other. Remembering this principle, then, let us examine the Book of Common Prayer of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

We find retained in it every passage of the English book which teaches the divine institution of a threefold ministry. Not one is omitted; not one is modified in tone so as to be less confident or authoritative.

But beyond this we find in a service that is not in the English book the assertion of her belief in a divinely established ministry of divers Orders, and in Apostolical Succession. In her solemn addresses to the throne of grace at the institution of ministers, she says as in the Ordinal:

"Most gracious God, the giver of all good and perfect gifts, who of thy divine providence hast appointed DIVERS ORDERS in thy Church, give thy grace, we beseech thee, to thy servant," etc., etc.

And then:

"Oh Holy Jesus, who hast purchased to thyself an universal Church, and *hast promised to be with the ministers of* APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION *to the end of the world*, be graciously pleased to bless the ministry and service of him," etc., etc.*

These two collects, placed side by side, are of themselves a sufficient refutation of all that Mr. Goode has put forth as the doctrine of the Church. While they remain it will be but waste of time and labor to argue that the Church countenances those who reject

* See Appendix D.

the divinely appointed ministry of divers Orders, to which, as the ministry of "Apostolical Succession," she holds that the special presence of the Lord Jesus is promised!

This closes our examination of the formularies. We believe our appeal to them has not been in vain. They speak in no uncertain tone.

CHAPTER VIII.

LAWS AND OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

THE Standards already treated of do not contain a formal code of laws for the government or discipline of the Church, nor can we with certainty deduce from them even the general principles on which, in many instances, that government should be conducted. Such a code, then, was necessary, and it was produced (as the common law was) by successive enactments from time to time. It consists of, or is to be found in, Canons passed in Convocation, official injunctions, articles of inquiry, etc., etc.

In connection with the founding of this system of ecclesiastical government, we observe that the English Reformers exhibited in it the same moderation and judgment as in other matters. Whatever in the existing system was evil in itself or in its tendencies, they cast out, but whatever was Scriptural or tended to profit, they retained without caring whether it was used by Rome or not.

Upon these principles the claim of the Pope to have supremacy in the visible Church, or to be in any way superior to the other Bishops, *jure divino*, was rejected as mere groundless and arrogant assumption; but a ministry of "divers Orders," and

the government of the Church by Bishops having full Scriptural warrant, were retained as not only lawful, but unquestionable; and even the regulations of the old Canon law, so far as they did not maintain things expressly rejected, were held to be in force until the Church reformed had enacted another code to take its place.* That Canon law placed the ordinary government of the Church in the hands of the Bishops as theirs of right,† and positively prohibited any one from acting as a Priest or minister until he had received Episcopal ordination.

This was the system under the old *regime*, and because it had not originated under it, but had divine warrant and the sanction of the Church of Christ, in every age it was preserved, avouched in the Standards already considered, acted upon in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and either actually enjoined or else assumed in every law and ordinance set forth in the English Church.

Notwithstanding the speculations about parity of "Order" between the Bishop and the Priest, no divine of that day had ever heard or "read that any but a Bishop might ordain a Priest." And so when the papal power was abjured and true doctrine brought in, *those, and only those, who had previously received ordination at the hands of a Bishop, were acknowledged*

---

* Percival Wyburn describing the state of the Church in England even in the time of Elizabeth, says: "The greater part of the Canon law is still in force, and all ecclesiastical censures are principally taken from it."—(*Zurich Letters 2nd series*, p. 359. *Parker Soc'y.*)

† Theirs by right divine. It is true that the Canonists in order to flatter and uphold the Pope, taught that the *jus divinum* was derived through him rather than inherent in the Episcopal office; but this innovation of doctrine as to *the medium* does not affect the primary belief, nor indeed their own belief of *the fact*.

and permitted to act as ministers of the Church. There was no new rule adopted by which those who might claim to have received authority or "ordination" from Presbyters only, might be recognized. On the contrary, as already stated, every Canon, injunction or article of inquiry issued during or since the Reformation either distinctly reaffirms the principle referred to, or takes that principle for granted.

Mr. Goode, knowing very well that *these* "Standards of our Church" not only give no shadow of support to his theory, but oppose it in every particular, has taken especial pains to avoid them; and so hostile are they to the views which he and his disciples wish to introduce, that in all probability their right to be regarded as standards will be strenuously denied.

The most plausible objection to them is that they are not all now in force; but this is mere trifling. They were, when enacted and until suspended by some new regulation or rendered unnecessary by lapse of time, as obligatory as any law could possibly be, and in their spirit (being based upon principles which are the same perpetually) they are binding still. Clergymen of the English Church do not feel bound now-a-days to use in private or ordinarily the gowns, hoods, quoifs or night-caps enjoined nearly three hundred years ago, for conformity to the letter of the Canon in this particular would be a violation of its spirit; but they *are* bound to observe such decency of apparel as shall indicate their calling and secure for them the respectful regard of the people. And so with many other matters. We do not refer then to the Canons and other regulations of the

English Church as all of them binding now, in the letter of them (least of all upon members of the American branch), but as binding in the spirit of them—as laws positively enacted and obeyed in the past, and therefore as true and proper exponents of the Church's doctrines or principles.

Let us look into them then and see what light they throw upon the question—Which is the correct form of Church Government, and what constitutes a true and lawful ordination to the Christian Ministry?

We date the establishment of the Church of England as a free Reformed Church from the year 1547, when on the death of Henry VIII. his admirable son Edward VI. ascended the throne. During that, year and before proper steps could be taken by ecclesiastical authority for regulating the affairs of the Church, the King (or Archbishop Cranmer and the Council in his name and with his concurrence) issued injunctions for the prevention of evil and the advancement of true religion. In these all parsons, curates, etc., are ordered to procure "one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume in English," and also "The Paraphrasis of Erasmus, also in English, upon the Gospels (which was all of the work then published) and to have the

"Same set up in some convenient place within the said church that they have cure of, whereas their parishioners may most commodiously resort unto the same and read the same."

Of the work thus authorized we shall have more to say hereafter.

In the same injunctions (Edward VI., A. D., 1547) there is an order concerning the treatment of those

who though not well learned, and but lately mere "mass priests" were yet truly ordained men.

"*Forasmuch as their office and function is appointed of God*, the King's Majesty willeth and chargeth all his loving subjects, that from henceforth they shall use them charitably and reverently, for their office and ministration sake, and especially all such as labor in setting forth God's holy word."—(*Doc. Annals*, Vol. i., p. 20.)

In consequence of the great number of persons in the ministry who being either heretical or ignorant, could not be trusted to preach, all such public teaching (save by such as were specially licensed) was prohibited by royal proclamation, and it was ordered that if any one should take upon him to preach openly, except the Bishop, parson, vicar, etc., in their own cure, he shall be forthwith committed to prison. And among the articles of inquiry issued in the same year were, whether those having cure of souls did in their absence allow any unqualified persons to minister in their parish, or at any time admit any man to preach, who had not been lawfully licensed thereto. (*Idem*, pp. 27, 44.)

In 1548 another proclamation was issued for restraining of heretical and seditious preaching by which every person who undertook to preach was required to exhibit his license to "the parson or curate and two honest men of the parish," and the Archbishop and Bishops were charged to punish those who broke this law. A similar proclamation was made in 1550. These facts show conclusively that if even the Priests whose Orders were unquestioned, were yet restrained in the exercise of their ministry, there could not be the least toleration of

those who without lawful ordination might take upon them to preach or perform other clerical acts.

In 1549 was published the Ordinal which, in its Preface, asserts the divine institution of a threefold ministry and the continuance or Succession of the same from the time of the Apostles, and which in each of its divisions gives, as of right, the power of ordination to the Bishop, and to him exclusively.*

In 1552 the second Prayer Book, and the "Articles of Religion" were published, and in the latter the Ordinal was specially endorsed, as containing all things necessary to ordination, and as being entirely free from superstition. Thus it was defended against the attacks of Romanists on the one hand and of extravagant or "Scythian" Reformers on the other.

At that time the Church's great difficulty was the Romish party, and therefore we find absolute prohibition of all public and private celebrations of mass, or any other Romish service "contrary to the form and order of the Book of Communion,"—the Book of Common Prayer. But even in the reign of Edward there were some Protestants who, filled with their own devices, separated themselves from the Church and procured ministers or teachers who of course were not Episcopally ordained. Now, if the theory of Mr. Goode were correct (that Church government is a matter of indifference — that individual or particular churches may choose whatever form they please — that power of ordination belongs of right to others as well as Bishops, and that our Church ac-

* In the ordination of Presbyters the other Priests (or Presbyters) present join with the Bishop in laying on of hands, but this fact does not affect the statement made above. The Bishop ordains authoritatively; they concur.

knowledges all this), we should find our Reformers recognizing Separatists as constituting independent "churches," treating them with fraternal courtesy and admitting their ministers to be truly ordained. But what is the fact? Among the articles of inquiry issued by Bishop Ridley in his primary visitation of the Diocese of London, A.D. 1550, is the following:

"Whether any of the *Anabaptists' sect or other* use notoriously any *unlawful or private conventicle* wherein they do *use doctrine or administration of sacraments*, separating themselves from the rest of the parish?"

And further, among the injunctions given at the same visitation, we find it ordered:

"That *no persons use to minister the sacraments*, or in open audience of the congregation *presume to expound the Holy Scriptures, or to preach, before they be lawfully called and authorized* in that behalf."—(*Doc. Annals*, i. 96.)

Here then, during the very time when the formularies were being composed, we find those belonging to Anabaptists' and other "sects," who, though they had not been ordained by a Bishop, presumed "to use doctrine or administration of sacraments," described as not "lawfully called and authorized."

During the reign of Bloody Mary, Popery was revived and Protestants persecuted to the death, and so at the accession of Elizabeth it was necessary to go over nearly the same ground as at the beginning. Unlicensed preaching was prohibited, the divine institution of the ministry was affirmed, and conformity to the doctrines, laws and usages established in the reign of King Edward was enjoined. In the "Interpretation and further consideration" of the Queen's Injunctions for the better direction of the clergy, drawn up by the Archbishop and Bishops (A. D.

1559–60), we have special directions as to the literary and other qualifications of Deacons and Priests, and leave given to all men to object to the ordination of such as they might know to be unworthy in life or conversation. These directions were extended and repeated frequently, as we shall see, and they are part of the law of the Church to this day.

In the Articles of Inquiry for the Visitation of 1559 we see the usual question about preaching, etc., by unlicensed persons, and also the following with reference to Romanists and Puritans:

"Whether you know any man in your parish, secretly or *in unlawful conventicles*, say or hear mass, or *any* OTHER *service prohibited by law?*"—(*Idem*, p. 248.)

In the year 1560, it having been found that sundry persons infected with pernicious opinions had arrived in England, and were promulgating their views, causing "great danger of corruption and of increase of sects, contrary to the unity of Christ's Church," the Queen and Council commanded the Archbishop and other Bishops to visit the places troubled with these "sectaries," and openly to examine and try them "touching their phanatical and heretical opinions," and if they refused to be reconciled, ordered them to be banished from the kingdom within twenty days, on pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of all their goods. The same proclamation forbids all persons to

"Make any conventicles or secret congregations, either to read, or to preach, or to minister the sacraments, or to use any manner of divine service."—(*Idem*, p. 293.)

In this assuredly we have no acknowledgment of the right to set up "particular churches," and no very cordial recognition of the Orders of "our Non-Episcopal brethren."

Proclamations similar to the above were issued three or four times during the reign of Elizabeth, and were rendered necessary by the evil teaching of immigrants from the Continent, who, going to England "under pretence of flying from persecution," sought to substitute their own doctrines and practices for those of the Church so happily reformed.

In the year 1564 there were issued "Advertisements for due order in public administration of common prayers and using the holy sacraments." They were directed against the sectaries above referred to, and all within the Church who had imbibed any portion of their spirit. They "occasioned the first open separation of the Nonconformists from the Church of England." These, the Presbyterianizing churchmen, were beginning already to be a grievous cause of trouble. They commenced with objecting to clerical vestments, pleading conscience, and claiming the right to leave undone things commanded only by ecclesiastical authority. The Church, after having tried lenity and expostulation in vain, met them with the direct affirmation that though vestments, rites and ceremonies were things indifferent, and such as on proper occasion, and by proper authority, might be changed or set aside, yet that as no such occasion had arisen, and as the authorities continued to approve the things objected to, those refusing conformity would be regarded as obstinate and contentious, and punished accordingly.

In the same "Advertisement" we find the directions as to the qualifications of Deacons and Priests set forth more at large, and a protestation of intention to observe order and uniformity ordered to be signed

by all persons seeking admission to the ministry. These were drawn up by Archbishop Parker and five other Bishops as Commissioners, and were issued by the Queen.—(*Ibid*, vol. i., pp. 321, 331.)

In the year 1557, Archbishop Parker held a visitation of his Province, with especial reference to the Diocese of Norwich, where sundry evils had crept in. These were the fruit of the puritanic tendencies of Bishop Parkhurst, concerning whom Secretary Cecil wrote,

"He is blamed even of the best sort for his remissness in ordering his clergy. He winketh at Schismatics and Anabaptists, as I am informed."

Among the articles then enquired of were the following: Whether those holding ecclesiastical offices in connection with Cathedrals, such as "Deans, Archdeacons, and other dignitaries," "*every one of them be ministers or not?*" as regards prebendaries, etc., *what Orders they be in?*" whether any minister did

"Openlie preach or teach any unwholesome, erroneous, seditious doctrine," or "*persuade or move any not to conform themselves to the order of religion reformed, restored, and received by public authority in this Church of England;*" "or do say, teach, or maintain" "that it is lawful for any man, without outward calling of the Magistrates appointed* [*i. e.* Bishops],

* Magistrate means, literally, one exercising a mastery: more generally the person who makes or administers law. And as there are ecclesiastical laws, so there are, of course, ecclesiastical magistrates. Of these, Bishops are the chief. Persons not accustomed to this use of the word, and doubting its propriety, are referred to the 34th Article.

"Whosoever through his private judgment willingly and purposely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly * * * as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the *Magistrate*, and woundeth the consciences of weak brethren."

Contrast with this the 37th Article, the title of which is "Of the *Civil* Magistrate." Bishop Horne uses the word as we have done above

to take upon him any ministry of Christ's Church?"—(*Doc. Annals*, Vol. i., pp. 337, etc., etc.)

In the Visitation Articles of the same Archbishop Parker, 1569, there are the following inquiries,

"Whether there be in your Parishes * * * * anye that commonlye absente themselves from theyre owne churches; or otherwise idely or lewdly prophaneth the Sabbath day? Any that keepe any secret conventicles, preachings, lectures, or readings contrary to the lawes?" and "Whether there be any parsons that intrude themselfe, and *presume to exercise any kinde of ministery in the Church of God* without imposition of hands and ordinary aucthority?"—(*Doc. Annals*, Vol. i. p. 337).

Up to the year 1571, there had been no regulation for the receiving of Romish priests who had abandoned their superstitions. All that was required of them was a *general* avowal of Protestant principles. But it was found that, for the want of some stricter test, many persons, who were "enemies to the true religion," were admitted to serve in the Church, and, therefore, in the well-known law, 13 Elizabeth, Cap. 12, confirming the standards, and requiring all who sought admission to the ministry to subscribe the Articles, it was ordered that those who had been ordained by some form other than that set forth by authority, should be received as ministers, or allowed to have cure of souls if they subscribed to the Articles. This provision, made expressly with reference to Roman Catholic Priests, was claimed by some holding Presbyterian Orders as extending to them, seeing they also were "ordained" by a form different from that set forth by authority.* Their claim was

* Mr. Goode agrees with the individual whom he designates as the "notorious puritan," Travers, in supposing that this law allowed Presbyterian ministers to enter the Church after subscription; he says (page 48), "The parties more particularly in the eye of the framers of the Act

rejected, as we shall see in the next chapter, and that rejection shows plainly that the Church did not regard them as *validly* ordained, if ordained at all.

From this time forth the Puritans were the great difficulty, the chief disturbers of the Church's peace. They began, as we have said, by objecting to the surplice, etc., but soon extended their opposition to several of the ceremonies, then to the entire Prayer Book; and, gathering boldness as they proceeded, they openly attacked the whole administration of the Church; teaching that it was not yet fully reformed, and that, as there was no scriptural authority for the offices of Archbishop, Archdeacon, etc., etc., these offices should be abolished.* To check them, there were various proclamations issued, and laws passed "against the despisers or breakers of the Orders prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer," in which

---

were *probably* (?) those ordained by the Romish form, *but the application of the clause was of course general.*" We beg the Reverend gentleman's pardon. It was *not* general. The Government, as well as the Authorities of the Church, decided against any such extension of it.

* The progressive course of Puritanism is well displayed in Lord Bacon's "Advertisement touching Controversies," and in the following extracts from Bishop Cooper's Admonition [A.D. 1589]:

"At the beginning some learned and godly preachers, for private respects in themselves, made strange to wear the surplice, cap, or tippet; but yet so that they declared themselves to think the thing indifferent, and not to judge evil of such as did use them. Shortly after rose up other, defending that they were *not* things indifferent, but distained with Antichristian idolatry, and therefore not to be suffered in the Church. Not long after came other sort affirming, that those matters touching apparel were but trifles, and not worthy of contention in the Church, but that there were greater things far, of more weight and importance, and indeed touching faith and religion, and therefore meet to be altered in a Church rightly reformed; as the Book of Common Prayer, the Administration of Sacraments, the Government of the Church, the Election of Ministers, and a number of other like. Fourthly, now break out another sort, earnestly affirming and teaching that *we* have NO CHURCH, NO BISHOPS, NO MINISTERS, NO SACRAMENTS, and, therefore, that all who love Jesus Christ ought, with all speed, to separate themselves from our congregations because our assemblies are *profane, wicked,* and *Antichristian.*"

reference is made to "diversity of rites and ceremonies, disputations and contentions, schisms and divisions already arisen" in place of "one godly and uniform order;" and all Archbishops, Bishops, justices, mayors, etc., are charged and commanded to

"Put in execution the Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments," "neither favoring nor dissembling with one person nor other who doth neglect, despise, or seek to alter the godly rites set forth in the said book," but that they shall "apprehend him, and cause him to be imprisoned." And further,

"If any persons shall, either in private houses or in public places, make assemblies, and therein use other rites of Common Prayer and administration of the Sacraments than is prescribed in the said book, or shall maintain in their houses any persons being notoriously charged, by books or preaching, to attempt the alteration of the said Orders, they shall see such persons punished with all severity according to the laws of this realm, by pains appointed in the said act."—(*Idem*, p. 386.)

Among the "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical," passed A.D. 1571 we find it ordered that the Bishop

"Shall *receive no traveller or unknown person to a share in the income of the clergy, or to any ecclesiastical ministry except he shall bring with him commendatory letters from that Bishop from whose Diocese he may have come.* And again, that he shall suffer no one to be engaged in the ministry of the Church who will not receive imposition of hands."—(*Cardwell's Synodalia*, vol. i. pp. 113, 114, 115).

Among the Articles questioned at the primary visitation of Archbishop Grindal (who succeeded Parker, A.D. 1575), is the following:

"Whether any person or persons *not being ordered at least for a Deacon*, or licensed by the ordinary [*i. e.* as a lay reader], do say Common Prayer openly in your Church or Chapel," etc., etc.

"Whether there be any in your parish that openly or privately say mass or hear mass, or *any* OTHER *kind of service or prayer* than is set forth by the laws of this realm?" .And

"Whether any Priest or minister be come into this diocese out of any other diocese, to serve any cure here, *without letters testimonial of the ordinary from whence he came, under his authentic seal and hand, to testify the cause of his departing from thence, and of his behavior there.*"—(*Doc. Annals*, Vol. i., pp. 404, 407.)

We would invite the reader's especial attention to these articles, as we shall have occasion to refer to them again.

At this time the regulations for receiving candidates for Orders were again set forth, but still more plainly and fully than before. We find them in the "Canons," or Articles agreed upon in "the Convocation or Synod holden at Westminster," A. D. 1575.

They direct,

I. "That none shall be admitted Deacon or Minister, but such as shall bring to the Bishop satisfactory testimonials of honest life and sound doctrine, as set forth in the Articles of religion, and shall subscribe to the said Articles, and shall be able to render to the Bishop in Latin an account of his faith, agreeable to the same; that the Deacon shall be of the age of twenty-three years, and 'shall continue in that office the space of a whole year, at the least, before he be admitted to the Order of priesthood;' that neither of these Orders be given, except on a Sunday or holy day, and in the face of the Church, and in such manner and form, and with all such other circumstances as are appointed by the book entituled, 'The Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.'"

II. "That no Bishop shall give either of the said Orders to any that be not of his own diocese (other than graduates resiant in either of the Universities), unless they be dimitted under the hand and seal of that Bishop of whose diocese they are, and *not* upon letters dimissory of any Chancellor or other officer to any Bishop."

III. That none be admitted to any cure or spiritual function who, during Mary's reign, had been "made Priests, being children, and otherwise utterly unlearned." We give the words of the injunction to which the Canon refers. It directs also that "straight and diligent examination be used in the admission of all curates to the charge of any cure."

IV. "That diligent inquisition be made in every diocese for all such as have forged and counterfeit letters of Orders,

that they may be deposed by the Commissioners Ecclesiastical."*

V. "That the Bishops by their letters do certify one to another the names of such counterfeit Ministers, to the end they be not suffered to serve in any other diocese."

VI. That none be ordained *sine titulo*, etc., etc.

VII. "That none shall be admitted to any dignity or benefice with cure of souls, unless he be qualified according to the tenor of the first Article," etc., etc.

VIII. That all licenses for preaching hitherto granted be revoked, and reissued to "such as shall be thought meet for that office."

Nothing could be more strict than the observance of the settled order of the Church required by these Canons, which, the reader will observe, were adopted at a Synod held under the auspices of Archbishop Grindal.—(*Cardwell's Synodalia*, Vol. i., pp. 132, etc.)

In 1583, the celebrated John Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury, and two years after he presided at a Convocation in w ich these Articles were re-enacted; and it was further decreed that no Bishop (on pain of suspension) should admit any to holy Orders who were not of the quality [or "ability"] required by them, and that persons unqualified were not to be admitted to any benefice.

In 1584, the same directions were given by the Archbishop, and three Articles, professing full conformity, were published, without consent and subscription to which none might be "permitted to preach, read, catechize, minister the sacraments, or to execute any other ecclesiastical function." It was at the same time enjoined,

"That none be permitted to preach or interpret the Scriptures, *unless he be a Priest or Deacon at the least, admitted thereunto according to the laws of this realm.*"

* The forging of such letters was frequently practised by those who yet described themselves as "*men of tender consciences!*"

The Puritan controversy was now at its height; the leaders of the faction had proceeded from attacking those dignities or Orders for which divine right was not claimed, and from censures upon the wealth, state, and authority of Bishops, to attacking the Episcopal Order itself. They took the precise ground of Mr. Goode, that Bishops are not a separate "Order," but one and the same with Priests, and, consequently, that ordination performed by Presbyters was valid. The theory of Parity, despite its Romish origin, was adopted by them, and pushed to a length which set them in opposition to the teaching and usage of the Church in all ages.* The practice of the Continental Reformed Churches suggested the idea to them, and would, in the eyes of the least reflecting part of the public, seem to justify it; but as soon as it was plainly advanced, it was by the authorities of the Church just as plainly repudiated. Thus we see, in the "Articles to be inquired of in the visitation of the diocese of Chichester, *sede vacante*," 1585, by Archbishop Whitgift, the following:

"Whether doth he ['your minister'] or any other take upon them to reade lectures, or preach, being mere lay persons, or *not ordered according to the lawes of this realme, or not lawfully licensed*," etc., etc. — (*Documentary Annals*, Vol. ii. p. 23.)

* From asserting that, as Bishops and Presbyters were (in their estimation) one, and consequently that Presbyterian ordinations were allowable, or valid, they went on to claim that such ordinations alone were valid, and that Presbyterian government had divine right. On both these points, as well as on Separation, several of the chief men of their party dissented from them, and very many of the better informed among them, who were willing to go as far as the first, utterly rejected the second. Mr. Goode wishes to have it believed that the latter, the extreme doctrine, was the *only* one advocated by the Puritans (see his *Introduction*; also pp. 33, 45, etc.); but every tyro knows that the very theory he supports was that first propounded by them, that to which their best men clung, and that against which the first defenders of the Church argued.

"This," says Dr. Cardwell, "was one of the earliest declarations from authority against Orders conveyed by presbyters."

It was so because occasion for it had not previously existed. It was one of the first opportunities of asserting the Church's principles that occurred after it had been claimed by Travers that Presbyterian ordination was valid.

There were some petitions presented to the Parliament in the session of 1584 by the innovating party, in which they asked, among other things, that sundry restrictions be placed upon the Bishops in the matter of ordination. These were referred to the Bishops and all rejected as "unnecessary," "altogether needless," and calculated to "breed great trouble."—(*Doc. Annals*, Vol. ii., p. 9; also *Strype's Whitgift*, fol. ed., 1718, p. 187.)

But notwithstanding the negative replies of the ecclesiastical authorities to these propositions, the House of Commons, in which there was by that time a formidable body of Puritans, sent to the Upper House a petition breathing the spirit of opposition even more strongly.

It was designed, says Strype, to "clip the wings of the Bishops and to weaken if not destroy their courts." Among its Articles was one requiring that in the act of ordination *six presbyters should lay on their hands along with the Bishop*. The object of this was to give a Presbyterian character to the ordination by rendering the presence and act of Presbyters as necessary as those of the Bishop. But this innovation also was "utterly disallowed."—(*Strype's Whitgift*, p. 178.)

The Convocation of 1597 passed Canons with regard to the reception of candidates, and the ordination, and institution of ministers, of the same character as those already quoted, and those subsequently enacted which are in force at the present time. — (*Synodalia*, Vol. i., p. 147.)

In March, 1603, James I. succeeded Elizabeth. In October of the same year he issued "a proclamation concerning such as seditiously seek reformation in Church matters" in which "chastisement" is threatened against all those "reformers" who, under pretence of "zeal, affect novelty," "whose heat tendeth rather to combustion than reformation;" "some using public invectives against the state ecclesiastical here established, and some contemning their authority and the practice of their courts." In this document it is declared that

"The estate of the Church established and the degrees and Orders of the ministers governing the same, are agreeable to the Word of God and the form of the primitive Church."

Another proclamation was issued in the following year against Presbyterianizing Churchmen described as "certain ministers" and others "who under pretended zeal for reformation, are the chief authors of divisions and sects among the people," in which they were warned

"*Either to conform themselves to the Church of England and obey the same, or else to dispose of themselves and their families some other ways as to them shall seem meet.*" — (*Doc. Annals*, Vol. ii. p. 80, etc.)

This was followed by several circular letters from Archbishop Bancroft, requiring the strictest execution of the existing laws against those who from "a

factious desire of innovation refused to yield their obedience and conformity thereunto." And though the Puritans were at that time a numerous and powerful party, they were by the diligent application of the laws cut off from the Church and made to stand out as no longer members but opponents of it. Thus showing that the Church was willing to lose adherents and influence rather than yield up any portion of her doctrines and constitution. What she believed to possess divine right she would not yield even for the sake of peace.

Within a generation those enemies became strong enough to overthrow both the civil and ecclesiastical government, and to establish for a time their own "*purer*" system; but *never* at any period of their history were their peculiar doctrines tolerated by the Church. In good report and evil, in prosperity and in adversity she steadfastly maintained the principles upon which she had been reformed, and denounced as "schismatics" and "turbulent persons" all who sought to change them. To this fact the record of her legislative acts bears incontrovertible testimony.

The Convocation of the same year (1604) passed the memorable enactments which are still the law of the English Church, and which as such are called "The Canons." In these the authorities compelled by the circumstances of the time to act sternly with the disorderly and malicious impugners of her forms and character, denounce all such persons as excommunicate. Ex. gra.

VIII. "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm or teach that the form and manner of making or consecrating bishops, priests, or deacons containeth any thing in it that is repugnant to the Word of God, or that they who are made Bishops, Priests, or

Deacons in that form, are not lawfully made, nor ought to be accounted," etc., etc. "Let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*, not to be restored until he repent and publicly revoke such his *wicked errors*."

IX. "Whosoever shall hereafter separate themselves from the communion of saints as it is approved by the Apostles' rules in the Church of England, and combine themselves together in a new *brotherhood* [not '*a new Church*,' observe] accounting the Christians who are conformable to the doctrine, government, rites, and ceremonies of the Church of England, to be profane and unmeet for them to join with, let them be excommunicated *ipso facto*," etc., etc.

X. "Whosoever shall hereafter affirm that such ministers as refuse to subscribe to the form and manner of God's worship in the Church of England, prescribed in the Communion Book, and their adherents, may truly take unto them the name of *another* CHURCH not established by law, and *dare to presume to publish it*, or that this their PRETENDED CHURCH hath of long time groaned under the burden of certain grievances imposed upon it," etc., etc. "Let him be excommunicated *ipso facto*," etc., etc.

XI. "Whosoever shall affirm or maintain that there are within this realm other *meetings*, *assemblies*, or *congregations* of the king's born subjects than such as by the laws of this land are held and allowed, *which may rightly challenge to themselves the name of* TRUE *and* LAWFUL CHURCHES, let him be excommunicated and not restored but by the Archbishop after his repentance and public revocation of such his *wicked errors*."

Ten Canons (commencing with XXXI.), of too great length to be quoted, reaffirm the principles always acted on, and establish the method now followed in receiving, ordaining, and instituting ministers; and as at this day they effectually exclude from our ministry all but those who have received Episcopal ordination, so did they then 260 years ago.

The same Convocation, at an adjourned session in 1606, passed a body of Canons chiefly "in opposition to the principles laid down in the book of Parsons the Jesuit," in which it is maintained that the constitution of the Church under the Patriarchs, and under the Mosaic dispensation, indicated the will of the

Most High that it should always have grave and reverend persons to rule and minister in it, whose offices and authority should differ in degree. This argument (used so ably by Bishop Bilson in his "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church," A. D. 1593) the Bishops and Divines conduct through an entire book of thirty-six lengthy Canons. In the second book they expressly defend the divine institution of Episcopacy, and the exclusive right of the Bishops to ordain. As for instance, in Canon vi. of Book ii., where they deny that any of the "second degree and Order" "*had any power committed unto them at all to make ministers,*" while the Apostles kept the said power in their own hands. They then proceed to state that when the Apostles, to preserve order and prevent schisms, appointed some to have the "rule, government, and direction of" presbyters; and when they had "designed and chosen them to be Bishops," they communicated upon them "as well their Apostolical authority of *ordaining of ministers*, and the power of the keys, as of preaching and administering the sacraments."

The Seventh Canon asserts that they "do greatly err" who hold

"That it was an idle course held by the primitive Churches and ancient fathers to keep the catalogue of their Bishops, or to ground arguments in some cases upon their SUCCESSION, in that they were able to deduce their beginnings either from the Apostles or from some Apostolical persons; or that the form of government used in the Apostles' times for the planting and ordering of Churches was not in many respects as necessary to be continued in the Church afterwards"—"or that any Church since the Apostles' time, till of late years, when it received the Gospel had not likewise Archbishops and Bishops for the government of it"—"or that any since the Apostles' time, till of late days, was *ever held to be a lawful minister of the Word*

and Sacraments, who was not ordained Priest or minister by the imposition of the hands of some Bishop — or that it is with any probability to be imagined that *all the Churches of Christ and ancient fathers from the beginning would ever have held it for an Apostolical rule that none but Bishops had any authority to make Priests*, had they not thought and judged that *the same authority had been derived unto them*, the said Bishops, *from the same Apostolical ordination that was committed unto Timothy and Titus, their predecessors*"—"or that it doth proceed from any other than *the wicked spirit* for any sort of men, what godly show soever they can pretend, to seek to discredit (as much as lieth in them) *that form of Church government which was established by the Apostles, and left by them to continue in the Church to the end of the world*," etc., etc.—(*Cardwell's Synodalia*, Vol. i., pp. 330 to 379; also *Overall's Convocation Book*, Oxford ed., 1844, p. 141, etc.)

In 1640, Charles I. being King and Laud Archbishop of Canterbury, Canons were passed by Convocation which were merely a new setting forth of those already quoted. Knowing how bitterly Laud is spoken of, and how decidedly even Mr. Goode attributes to him the introduction of "the theory of Apostolical Succession," we are surprised to find that in the laws enacted under his presidency, there is no new element like undue severity and exclusiveness, but simply a reaffirming of the same principles steadily maintained in the Church for a century, and that the tone of the Canons adopted under his authority, wherein it is at all different, is even less stern than that of those issued nearly forty years before.

Beside a chapter against Popish recusants, they contain one against "sectaries," and it directs that Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, Familists, or other sects, who "endeavor the subversion both of the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England no less than Papists do, although by another way," shall be liable to the "proceedings and penalties

which are mentioned in the aforesaid Canon, as far as they shall be appliable."

When Laud and Charles were murdered, and the Puritan Commonwealth established, the Bishops and other ministers of the Church were ruthlessly driven from their dioceses and parishes, and their places were supplied by those whose loud and long-continued objections to the established religion, and whose zealous efforts to erect another more spiritual system, seemed to promise halcyon days when they would be at the helm of affairs. We need not remind the reader how the promise was fulfilled — what multiplication of sects, what glaring heresies, what blasphemies and fanaticism marked those dreary years in which the Church of England was under the iron heel of the persecutor. Suffice it to say that the whole nation, disgusted, terrified, and almost hopeless, eagerly sought safety in what it had discarded, brought back its King and reinstated the Church.

At the Restoration, the Presbyterians, made wiser by experience, lowered their tone. They made a strong effort to gain admission to the Church; to have Episcopacy reduced to (what Mr. Goode says it really is) a mere arrangement of convenience or expediency. Such an Episcopacy they were willing to receive. They asked to have the Liturgy modified to suit them, and their "Orders" acknowledged as valid. But the Convocation would not surrender a single principle; and so the usurping ministers were thrown out of the churches from which Episcopal clergymen had been driven before, and no one was admitted to act as a Presbyter or Deacon who had not been Episcopally ordained and sworn to conformity.

After the Savoy Conference the Liturgy was revised (for the last time), and among the alterations made was that in the Preface to the Ordinal, which Mr. Goode has represented as being an innovation, but which we have already shown to be a mere change of one form of expression for another which more plainly and appropriately conveyed the same sense. As Episcopal ordination had always been required, so now the restored Church stated in terms altogether unmistakable that it always would be. There was no change whatever of the law or of principle. The Parliament adopted the proceedings of the Convocation, and by the "Act of Uniformity" determined expressly that none but those who had received Episcopal ordination should be allowed to hold preferments in the Church or administer the Sacraments.—(See *Short's History Church of England*, Amer. ed., p. 276; also *Hume, Macaulay*, etc., *in loco*, *Carwithen's History, Statutes at Large*, etc., etc.)

We shall revert now to the code of 1604, for the purpose of noticing the *one only reference* Mr. Goode has ventured to make to the laws of his Church.

Hoping to show on the part of the Anglican authorities a cordial recognition of a Non-Episcopal denomination, he says:

"By the 55th Canon of 1604, all our Clergy are required, in the bidding of prayer before, or rather in the commencement of the sermon, to pray for 'the Church of Scotland.' *Now the Church of Scotland, at the time this canon was passed, was Presbyterian, as it now is.*"

This is a very grave mistake. The Church of Scotland was not Presbyterian as it is now, nor Presbyterian at all in 1604. The direction in the Canons of 1604 was given simply and solely because *then* for

the first time the Reformed Church of Scotland, thoroughly Episcopal in its constitution and under one Sovereign with the English Church, had sought and been admitted to fellowship with it.

At the time of the Reformation, Episcopacy was not abolished in Scotland. The supremacy of the Pope was rejected, but the Episcopal Order was not denounced even by the "Scythian Reformers" of Caledonia; it was only declared by act of the Scottish Parliament (prepared at the request or under the influence of John Knox himself) that

"Na Bischop nor uther prelat use any jurisdiction in tymes to cum *by the Bischop of Rome's authoritie.*"

In the confession of faith presented to that Parliament (1560) by the Reformers, there is no declaration of ministerial "parity," no denial of the Scriptural warrant for Episcopacy. So far indeed were the founders of the Scottish Reformed Church from the principles of modern Presbyterians that they instituted a sort of Episcopacy, appointing "Superintendents" to whom they gave the administrative power of Bishops. And they would have given them more if it had not been that the Bishops refused to sanction the Reformation, and of course would not ordain them to the Episcopal office.

As these Superintendents were appointed by the Church only, the government was not satisfied with them. Bishops were an Order in the Legislature which the constitution required, and "Superintendents" were not Bishops appointed according to the laws of the country; therefore to maintain the order and completeness of the Parliament, and also to maintain its own right of nomination, the government

appointed three ministers to be Bishops of Sees then vacant (1571). The Kirk protested against this (through Erskine of Dun), but its protest was not at all against the order of Bishops, but against the government's appointing them. That right, it contended, belonged to itself, and not to the civil authority. In that very protest reference is made to "Titus, Bischop of Crete;" the Episcopate is included among the "offices God hath appointed," and it is expressly affirmed that

> "*To take away the office of a Bischop so that no Bischop be in the Kirk, were to alter and abolish the Order that* God *has appointed in his Kirk.*"

But, notwithstanding the efforts of its friends, the Superintendent system was overthrown, and Episcopacy left without a rival.

In 1575 Melville, who had just arrived from Geneva, organized the first opposition ever shown in Scotland to Bishops as such. He and his party, unwilling to submit to their superiors, procured an Act of the Assembly denouncing Episcopacy as unscriptural; but it never became law, as it was vetoed by the Government. After the "Raid of Ruthven," however, when King James was in the hands of the conspirators, and there was no government or lawful authority in the land, the Presbyters under the protection of these same conspirators, took "some bold measures towards *exterminating* the Episcopal Order out of the Church.' Even Robertson (himself a Scotch Presbyterian minister) testifies that it was solely owing to their want of sufficient power that they "did not deprive and perhaps excommunicate all the Bishops in Scotland." They succeeded so far as to

set up a system of government by General Assemblies; but the restoration of order and authority changed all this. Robertson says:

"When the King regained his liberty, things put on a very different aspect. Such laws were passed as completely overthrew the [new and usurped] constitution of the Church."

Assemblies were pronounced illegal, and Episcopacy restored to its proper position.

Soon after this, various causes conspired to weaken the power of the Sovereign, and personal dislike to at least one or two of the leading Bishops rendered him less anxious to imperil his own cause by upholding theirs. His turbulent Nobles and still more turbulent Presbyters forced from him concessions which legalized the sitting of Assemblies and Kirk-sessions, and reduced the Episcopal office to a sort of Moderatorship. In 1591 they gained more still, and in 1592 Presbyterianism triumphed, and had full sway. But when, by very disagreeable experience, it was found that such concessions only served to make the "ministers" more unreasonable, and to threaten serious attacks on his own constitutional rights, the King roused himself once more, and "humbled their power." In so doing he did not act at all against the will of his people. So odious had the self-appointed "leading men" of the Presbyterians become to their own brethren and to the public, that their fall gave general pleasure. In two General Assemblies "a majority declared in favor of the measures which were agreeable to the King" (A. D. 1597), thus showing that the restoration of Church order was pleasing to them. The convoking of General Assemblies without the royal permission was then declared illegal, the right of appointing pastors to

principal towns was vested in the crown, and the persecuted Bishops were restored to the enjoyment of the temporalities of their Sees, reinstated partially in their spiritual office, and admitted again to their seats in Parliament. *Thus Presbyterianism was abolished by law in Scotland, and for at least forty years afterward had no existence.*

In 1600 acts were passed both in the Assembly and the Legislature, extending and confirming the power of the Bishops; and in 1603, when James succeeded Elizabeth on the English throne, he gave to them the same power and authority that their compeers had in Britain. He was also anxious that they should possess an unquestionably valid Scriptural authority, and therefore, having nominated three persons to fill vacant Sees, he directed them to receive consecration from the English Bishops—a thing which up to that time he had no power to command and the English Prelates had no power to perform. Seven years, then, after the complete suppression of the short-lived and disorderly Presbyterian Kirk when the Apostolic form of polity was clearly established, and when some Scottish Bishops-elect were waiting consecration at the hands of English prelates the Canons of 1604 were passed, requiring all church ministers to pray for the "Church of Scotland." In this assuredly there was no endorsement of Presbyterianism, but rather indeed a cordial recognition of a sister church that had just cast it off.

In July of the same year (1604) a commission was issued in Scotland for arranging the terms of union between the two countries. Among the Commissioners were "John, Archbishop of Glasgow: David,

Bishop of Ross: George, Bishop of Caithness," etc., etc., and yet Mr. Goode ventures to state that in that year "The Church of Scotland was Presbyterian as it is now!"

We beg to refer the Reverend gentleman for the correction of this inexcusable error to Archbishop Spottiswood's History, pages 449–456. Robertson *in loco.* Lawson's History of the Church in Scotland, pages 240–269. Bishop Skinner's Church History, Vol. ii., pp. 234–6, and two other authorities from which we print the following sentences:

In the year 1600 "*The Presbyterian form of government* was, after eight years of intolerable agitation, *abolished by the King, with the full consent of an overwhelming majority of the ministers and the applause of the people,* whose opinions seem to have been changed by experience of its tyranny."—(*Stephens's History Church of Scotland,* Vol. i., page 417.)

"*From the time that the Assembly of Perth was held* (1597) *the Presbyterian constitution of the Church as established in* 1592, and the legitimate authority of its General Assemblies and other judicatories *may be regarded as subverted by the interferences of King James the Sixth.* On the 19th of December, 1597, soon after the Assemblies of Perth and Dundee, he brought his projects under the consideration of Parliament: when an act was passed ordaining that such pastors and ministers as his Majesty should at any time please to invest with the office, place and dignity of Bishop, Abbot or other prelate should in all time hereafter have vote in Parliament in the same way as any prelate was accustomed to have: declaring that all bishoprics presently vacant should be given by his Majesty to actual preachers and ministers. *Henceforward, therefore, and indeed from the General Assembly of Perth,* 1597, *the Church of Scotland must be regarded as* EPISCOPALIAN."—(*Compendium of the Laws of the Church of Scotland,* "published by authority." Part II., page 36.)

Thus we see that Mr. Goode's statement is entirely erroneous, and consequently the argument based upon it goes to the winds.

With these decisive extracts from and references

to the Canons and other authoritative declarations of the English Church, we take our leave of them and turn to those of our own. Mr. Goode's argument is conducted on the principle that the doctrine of the two Churches is identical, and therefore that whatever establishes it for one establishes it for both. Bearing this in mind then, let us consult the laws of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

The "Digest of the Canons," issued by authority of the General Convention, is one of "the Standards of our Church." It shows rather more kindness to Non-Episcopal ministers than the English Ecclesiastical laws, which refuse them any consideration or favor whatever. In Great Britain or its colonies, if the oldest or the most prominent among dissenting ministers were to seek admission to the ministry of the Church, he would have to go before the Bishop on precisely the same terms as if he had never claimed the character or exercised the function of a minister. Our Church probably in consideration of their feelings and their training in divinity allows such persons to enter after a shorter term of candidature than is required of others. But yet even with us they come as "Candidates for Holy Orders," and must be received first to the diaconate, and then if approved, to the priesthood. Thus there is no recognition whatever of any validity in their previous orders, but their ordination itself is a very unequivocal practical assertion of their insufficiency.

TITLE I., CANON 2, SECTION VIII., directs that "when a person who not having had Episcopal Ordination, has been acknowledged as an ordained minister or licentiate in any other *denomination* of Christians shall desire to be ordained in this Church, he shall give notice thereof to the Bishop," and produce satis-

factory evidence that "his desire to leave the 'denomination to which he belonged had not arisen from any circumstances affecting his religious or moral character," etc. etc. And then,

"[2] If the Bishop, or Standing Committee, shall think proper to proceed, the party applying to be received *as a Candidate* shall produce to the Standing Committee a testimonial" of pious, sober and honest life and sincere attachment "to the doctrines, discipline and worship of the Church," and "the Standing Committee being satisfied on these points, may recommend him to the Bishop to be received as a *candidate for Orders* in this Church," etc. etc.

The special favor shown to such parties is merely that whereas other candidates have to remain in that condition for one year at least, these may

"At the expiration of not less than *six months* from their admission as Candidates be ordained Deacons, on their passing the same examination as other candidates for Deacon's Orders; and in the examinations special reference shall be had to those points in which the *denomination* whence they came differs from this Church, with a view of testing their information and soundness in the same," etc. etc.

Such is the law of *our* Church, so far as it affects or takes any notice of those who are called "ministers" of other denominations; such is its estimate of the value or validity of Non-Episcopal ordination. There are, we know, a few Churchmen (extremists like Mr. Goode), who, as if determined to retain their own theory in the face of all evidence against it, assert that these laws requiring what is (though inaccurately) styled re-ordination and the invariable practice of the church in administering it to all who come to her from the ministry of other denominations precisely as if they had never received any commission whatever, do not convey, or amount to any repudiation or intimation of the invalidity of their previous "Orders."

It would seem but a waste of time to place argu-

ment or evidence before such persons. With them, indeed, *stat pro ratione voluntas.* Their minds are made up, and therefore the most imposing array of facts would not change their opinion. Fortunately they are few in number, and have not TRUTH in their custody.

What they *will not* see, however, is very plain to every one else in the Church and out of it. All Non-Episcopalians know it well,* and nearly all of them

---

* We will not quote here the strong language of their more fiery journalists or controversialists, but give a few sentences from two distinguished men, who have written against our Church with as much fairness, courtesy, and vigor as have ever been displayed on that side of the question.

The Rev. ALBERT BARNES (Presbyterian), repudiating the notion that the principles and practice of the Episcopal Church do not virtually deny the existence of a lawful and valid ministry among Non-Episcopalians, says:

"Is there any recognition of the Ministers of other denominations as having a right to preach the Gospel? Is there any introduction of them to the pulpits of Episcopal Churches? *Would such an introduction by any of the inferior clergy be tolerated or connived at by the Diocesan Bishop?* To ask these questions is to answer them. But another question may be asked here. It is, how can many of the Clergy of the Episcopal Church be satisfied with occupying such a position in regard to *their ministerial brethren of other denominations* as to have the FAIR INTERPRETATION of their conduct to be that they regard them as WHOLLY UNAUTHORIZED TO PREACH THE GOSPEL?"—(*Apostolic Church*, p. 245.)

The Rev. Dr. LEONARD WOODS (Congregationalist), Professor in Andover Seminary, describing what, from his stand-point, seem great evils, says:

"I shall explain my meaning by an example, and I can fix upon no one better adapted to my object than the late Edward Payson. I will suppose then that he is still alive, and that, after he has been a Congregationalist minister for a quarter of a century, it becomes a serious inquiry with him whether he shall change his denomination and become an Episcopal Minister." "The Bishop will not admit him to preach and administer the ordinances, on the ground of his previous ordination. Had he never been ordained one great difficulty would be avoided. But, although he verily believes that he has been called of God, and duly ordained, and has for so many years been authorized to fill the office of a Gospel Minister, he must, *by a public act, renounce it all, and count it for* NOTHING, *and receive ordination just as though he had never been ordained.*" "He must now, *by a public act, declare that he has never had any warrant from God to minister in holy things*, and that *all he has done in the ministerial office*, though fraught with such benefit to multitudes, *has been without* VALIDITY." He must "engage in a transaction which *implies, and is understood to imply*, that all his pious and successful labors have been

resent it bitterly. They are not satisfied with the apologetic explanations or subterfuges of those professing Churchmen. They reject them indignantly, and point to the formularies, the laws, and the history of our Church, as plainly supporting their own conclusions.

Before leaving this subject a word or two must be said upon a work that is *the Standard authority* upon all matters connected with the Ecclesiastical law of England. We refer to that now rare but invaluable book, "Gibson's Codex Juris Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ" [2 vols. folio, London, 1713]. Commenting on the Preface to the Ordinal, which we have already treated, the learned author says:

"BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND DEACONS.—Besides these, the Church of Rome hath five others, viz., Subdeacons, Acolyths, Exorcists,

---

performed *without any just authority*, and contrary to the will of his Lord and Master." "He has assisted in setting apart many well qualified young men to the ministry by prayer and the laying on of hands;" "but the moment the hands of the Bishop are laid an him he *must in fact*, though contrary to all the impulses of his heart, keep himself at a distance from all these servants of Christ, MUST DISALLOW THE VALIDITY OF THEIR ORDINATIONS, and must have no more *ministerial* intercourse with any of them." "If he puts himself under the sway of prelacy, he must submit to its dictates, and, by an unwilling and constrained practice, must support its exclusive claims. He has been accustomed * * * to offer up prayer to God in the Sanctuary * * according to the various promptings of his own fervent mind, and with the unction of the Holy Spirit; but * * * * when he comes to be confined to forms" he "is not permitted to express a thought or word, except what is in the book before him," etc., etc.—(*Objections to Episcopacy*, pp. 193, 197.)

Representations like these are frequently declared by some of our extremists to be unjust. They are somewhat so in minor details, and in *tone*. They are unfriendly in their spirit, but, as to their general scope, they are indisputably true; and no mere assertion will ever satisfy the public that they are not so.

One late writer says he had sometimes heard such "from ill-informed Non-Episcopalians," and that he "uniformly replied that such a notion was a proof of *their ignorance and prejudice*." (*Dr. Canfield's Review*, p. 25.) We would respectfully advise the Reverend gentleman to show to such men as Mr. Barnes or Dr. Woods his "most excellent reasons," rather than give them hard words.

The reader will find more on the subject of this note in Appendix, A.

Readers, and Ostiaries." "These (though some of them ancient) were *human* institutions, and as such cannot pretend to come under the limitation which immediately precedes "*from the Apostles' time;* for which reason, and because they were evidently directed *for convenience only*, and were not immediately concerned in the Sacred Offices of the Church, they were justly laid aside by our first Reformers."

Those, then, which were not so laid aside, but named and described in the ordinal, were *not* "human," but directly concerned in the Sacred Offices. But farther:

"'LAWFUL AUTHORITY.' It is *supposed* that this general expression was used, lest the direct limiting of it to Episcopal authority should give offence to the Protestant Churches abroad; *but that they meant Episcopal authority is plain enough from the last clause.*"

"'HAD FORMERLY.' This last clause seems designed to allow of Romish converted Priests, who were ordained by Bishops before, and *whom we receive without re-ordination* (if they renounce their errors), because that Church preserves the Order of Bishops, and the substance of the primitive forms in her ordination, though corrupted with many modern superstitious rites."

The 23d Article, which is also *supposed* to have been worded in general terms, "for the purpose of not excluding ministers of the foreign Reformed Church," is by the learned author said to have been moulded upon the preface to the Ordinal [or at least conceived in the same spirit], and is to be explained by it. He refers to the notes above given as applying to the Article.

From all this it is evident that the theory of Mr. Goode, and the interpretation he offers, are not correct. Until a higher authority than that of this unequalled jurist can be adduced in favor of them, they must stand condemned.

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH.

IF there were a difference between the teaching and the practice of the Church we might have considerable difficulty in deciding which was the best exponent of its spirit, and we would certainly find it no easy matter to bind an acute opponent to the issue. For if the custom were contrary to his wish, and the standards did not justify or agree with the custom, he would say that the administrators of the law had departed from the spirit of those who framed it. And on the other hand, if the usage were such as he desired and the laws the opposite, he would say that the latter were the product of a darker age, and that the Church having discovered their unworthiness had abandoned them.

But happily there is no such difficulty for us, no such opportunity for an antagonist. The Church is consistent. Let us examine her records, then, that we may see what light they cast upon the subject now discussed.

If Mr. Goode's theory be correct, history will show that neither the English Church nor our own ever gave special thought to the preservation of the Episcopal Order, or of the Apostolical Succession; and

that they both received into their service all godly and gifted persons who claimed to be ministers of Christ without even stopping to ask whether they had been Episcopally ordained or not. Such practice would necessarily follow if the Church's doctrine were what Mr. Goode represents it; but if our view is the true one, we will find that a totally different course was pursued.

We take it for granted that there will be no denial of the purely Episcopal character of the Church at the time of the Reformation. The ministry was then as it is now, constituted in divers Orders; the Bishop was then as now the only ordaining officer in the English Church. If this be granted (and we suppose no one will assert the contrary) then it rests with our author and his friends to show when or how this rule was first broken or abandoned. We have seen what the laws were at the beginning and all through the history of the Church, and unless we are pointed to some official rescinding of those laws, or some public and recognized official action of a contrary character, we must persist in maintaining that they never were rescinded or set aside — but were always in force, always acted on.

Reference is sometimes made (though not in the work before us) to the case of those foreign divines who were harbored and patronized by Cranmer and the other authorities in England, as if the kindness shown to them were equivalent to an acknowledgment of the sufficiency of Non-Episcopal ordination.*

* Reply to Bishop H. Potter's Pastoral, by Rev. J. C. Smith, D.D., in Church Monthly, July, 1865. Also Gallagher's Pamphlet on True Apostolical Succession, p. 30.

They were made professors in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—"therefore," say some advocates of Presbyterian Orders, "the English Church recognized their ministerial commission as valid." *Non sequitur.* Professors are not necessarily clergymen. But suppose the offices held by Peter Martyr Martin Bucer, Fagius, etc., to have been such as none but clerics could fill, does it follow that *their* appointment to them involved the recognition of Non-Episcopal Orders? The writers we are now referring to think it would, else they would not have brought their names into the controversy. They evidently suppose that those good men received their commission only by "the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery!" A little investigation would correct this mistake.*

One gentleman who writes under this erroneous impression, says they were appointed to act as "professors and *preachers.*"† If this were a fact it would not justify his inference, for these reasons: (1) It is not conceded that every person who preaches must be ordained. Many contend that laymen may do so, and instances in which laymen *have* preached with great success may be easily mentioned. The liberty we believe is granted in *all* Non-Episcopal Churches, nor was it refused in the ancient Church, as the case of Origen will prove. And (what is still more to our purpose) it is or has been granted in the English

* Dr. Smith calls them "Non-Episcopal divines." We have heard of another Clergyman who declared that "Melancthon was a Presbyterian Minister, and yet President of *the College* of Cambridge and Rector of the parish!"

† Rev. Mr. Gallagher, in the work mentioned before. This gentleman sometimes allows his zeal to carry him farther than his authorities would warrant.

Universities under special circumstances, though never, so far as we know, in the English *Church.** (2) If ordination be regarded as a necessary prerequisite, those men were ordained.

But we deny the assertion. If there be a particle of evidence in its favor we have not been so fortunate as to discover it. The little that we have upon the subject at all, points in the opposite direction.† We may be told that Peter Martyr was a Canon of Christ Church. It is confessed that he was, but what of that? Is a Canon necessarily a preacher? Is it not well known that laymen have frequently held such preferments with (or even without) dispensations?

But to strengthen the argument drawn from the case of those foreign divines, reference is sometimes made to the invitation given by Cranmer to John Calvin who certainly was not Episcopally ordained.‡ Yet it proves nothing to the point; Calvin was not

---

* Arguments in favor of lay preaching have been furnished by many men whose opinions are well worth considering, such men, for instance, as John Wesley, Adam Clarke, Bishop A. Potter, Dr. Muhlenburg, etc. It will not be supposed, however, that we regard the Church as acknowledging what they advocate, nor that we accept their views ourselves. We merely refer to them to show that if one or two learned men were allowed to preach that fact of itself would not necessarily imply that they were acknowledged as validly ordained ministers.

† Letter of Peter Martyr to Bucer, dated at Oxford, 1548, and urging him to go to England: "If you do not preach in your own person you must not doubt but that you will preach in those of others; for he who supplies material for preaching of others, may be said to preach in them." —(*Orig. Let.*, Vol. ii. p. 471.)

‡ Those who point to this invitation as implying a great deal, and who quote the civil or laudatory expressions in Cranmer's letter, would do well to consider the repeated invitations given to Melancthon and others, and the vastly more cordial tone of the communications addressed to them. Such comparison would at once destroy the idea that the authorities of the English Church had *special* regard for the great Genevan divine.

invited to enter the ministry of the Anglican Church, but to visit England for the purpose of consulting with British and other Reformers on uniformity of faith. On this head, then, we need say no more.

In the action of the Ecclesiastical Authorities with reference to the first Protestant Bishop of Gloucester, we see evidence of a jealous regard for the Episcopal Order. John Hooper, a good and zealous minister, fled from England to escape the persecution resulting from the law of the "Six Articles." He spent his time chiefly at Zurich, and became strongly attached to the mode of worship there established. On his return to England after Henry's death, he was at once employed in furthering the work of Reformation, and was soon nominated to the vacant See of Gloucester.

Some of his German friends who were then in England, seem to have been under the impression that he would not enter the hierarchy; but great as was the influence exerted upon him by his residence in Switzerland,* there is no reason for supposing that Hooper ever altered his original opinion on Church polity; nor do we believe that Bullinger would approve of his setting himself against the divinely constituted Order of the ministry. He was perfectly willing to accept the office, but he required some changes to be made before he would consent to be consecrated. He "scrupled" certain words in the oath, and the wearing of the Episcopal vestments,

* Hooper writes to Bullinger, "If I am able to effect anything, and my slender powers are of any benefit to the Church of Christ, I confess, and by the blessing of God will confess as long as I live, that I owe it to yourself, and my masters and brethren at Zurich."—(*Parker's Soc. Libr., Orig. Letters*, Vol. i. p. 73. See also, pp. 56, 84, etc., etc.)

and begged to be excused from using them. The Primate reminded him that all the other Bishops wore the same robes, and there could be no reason for rejecting them which would not be a reflection upon his brethren; and, furthermore, that he had no authority to allow any departure from canonical requirements. Hooper appealed to the amiable young king, who, finding that the Archbishop did not defend the objectionable words in the oath, erased them with his own hand, and left the other matter to be decided by the Bishops themselves. Ridley was then appointed to confer with Hooper, and did so; answering all his cavils, showing that the wearing of this or that colored robe, or the wearing of any at all was not an essential matter, but that settled and common order could not be broken to please any individual without endangering the whole system of law and usage. Hooper denied that the vestments were things indifferent. He saw in them an insult to Christ. It was a matter of conscience with him not to use any such "Aaronical habits," such "relics of Popery!" And so, though wisely counselled by Martyr and Bucer, to whose judgment Cranmer had referred the point, he continued obstinately to refuse compliance. The public soon became interested in the discussion. Hooper himself appealed to them. His friends represented him as a true Reformer, and those who opposed him as still inclined to Romish superstition! He was also said to be harshly treated, and this awakened sympathy. Those who were inclined either to defend or excuse him, regarded the Bishops as over strict, or as not fully "evangelical." Others again (by far the greater number) sided with

the authorities, and maintained that if anything were to be changed, it should be done in an orderly manner, and not to gratify the will of a single individual. Thus originated the two parties which, in one shape or another, have ever since existed in the Church.

Despite the reasoning of Ridley and Cranmer, and the advice of Bucer, the Bishop-elect continued obstinate. He would not conform to the law, and he even continued to declaim against it, so that one of his friends remonstrated with him on his "unreasonable and too bitter sermons." Finding him thus refractory, the Privy Council ordered him to remain a prisoner in his own house; and when even this did not check his opposition, he was committed to the Fleet. He then offered to resign, but *he was not allowed.* The course he had pursued tended to deprave the Episcopal Order, and to allow him then to refuse it after he had so sharply censured all other Bishops, would have been to give him a triumph, and show that the Order in question was little regarded. His offer was therefore refused, and he was kept a prisoner. At last, however, the firmness of the authorities prevailed. He came to his senses; was duly consecrated; wore the habits;* and thence after served God faithfully as a Bishop in the Church.

Now Hooper was personally dear to the men who, for the sake of law and decorum, were obliged to stand out so firmly against him; and the truth he

* "This Lent, habited in the Scarlet Episcopal Gown, after he had been initiated or consecrated after the manner of our Bishops, he preached before the King's majesty."—(*Hilles to Bullinger. Orig. Let.*, Vol. i., 271.)

preached was dearer still; is it conceivable then that at such a time they would allow the Church to be deprived of his services, or subject him to imprisonment if the office to which he had been nominated were merely one of human institution? If not only the dress belonging to it, but the office itself, were a matter of indifference, would they have kept up the controversy for nearly a year? or, if he could have shown that it was a mere matter of dignity would not his part of that discussion have been of a very different character?

Another proof of the zealous regard entertained for the Episcopal Order by the English Reformers is found in the fact, that strangers taking refuge in England were required to conform to it. Those persons were not English subjects, and so not properly under the jurisdiction of the British Ecclesiastics, and their condition as exiles made the authorities very unwilling to appear harsh or unkind to them. Yet a grave question was involved. Ought the Church to permit within her own bounds another mode of worship and polity, or the teaching of another faith? Would not this be an encouragement to those who loved novelty? would it not seem to sanction division, and thus endanger the peace of the Church? And ought so much to be yielded for the sake of hospitality? The Bishops thought not; and so, when a Church building was granted to strangers they were told that, though they might have their own pastors, they must use the services of the English Church, at least in the administration of the Sacraments. And even with respect to their ministry, they were required to come

as close to the Apostolic model as possible without actually abandoning the system of their own countries. To this end, Superintendents (nominal Bishops) were set over their Churches: A'Lasco in London, and Pollanus in Glastonbury. To these the ordinary pastors were subject, and they in turn were under the supervision of the Bishops in whose dioceses their charges lay.

The foreigners were not willing to accept the English services. A'Lasco, their most prominent man, and one highly favored by all the authorities, privately strengthened this feeling. His congregations presented remonstrances and petitions, and in answer to these the Bishops told them they must either conform to the services or "disprove them by the word of God." But this latter they could not do, and the former they would not; and so for at least a whole year they were not suffered to have the sacraments administered among them.* At last, owing to the kindness of Cranmer and the King, this restriction was removed. They were left free to use their own mode of worship, but *not to reject the Episcopacy.*†

---

*"Much mischief is stirred up against us by the Bishops, and especially by the Bishop of London, who does us the more harm, as he seems more actively to support the Word of God!" 'Micronius to Bullinger, *Orig. Let.* Vol. ii., pp. 569, 575. See also the Letters of Utenhovius in same volume.'

The perusal of the private communications of these men leaves a very painful impression. With a very few honorable exceptions, these foreigners abused the hospitality shown them. A'Lasco did his best to foment dissatisfaction in the English Church, and Micronius and others slandered or abused freely those who differed from them. While receiving protection and kindness, they privately spoke of their benefactors, to whom they were publicly most reverential, as "hypocritical and heretical Bishops;" and even Ridley is styled "rather a buffoon than a Bishop!"

† It was an Episcopacy *non jure divino*, an Episcopacy without Apostolical Succession. The Superintendent, as in Germany, was not of a higher Order, but simply *primus inter pares*.

Even in those early days strangers of a less commendable character flocked into England. In lands where the abolition of Episcopal regimen had loosened the bands of order, they had become holders of many foolish or ungodly notions, and finding no toleration for them among their own people, they went to England and represented themselves as suffering for the truth of the Gospel. They soon began to spread their peculiar doctrines, and breed a disorderly and schismatic spirit among the people. They unsettled some members of the foreign congregations, and thus, as well as by their disputations, excited the wrath of the pastors. Among the latter was Micronius, who, writing to Bullinger, speaks of the

"Heresies introduced by our countrymen. There are Arians, Marcionists, Libertines, Danists, and the like monstrosities in great number." "We have not only to contend with the Papists * * * but much more with the sectaries and Epicureans and *pseudo*-Evangelicals."

Now if Mr. Goode's representation of the Church's doctrine were correct, those "sectaries" would have been at least as well treated as the other refugees. On the broad principle of the right to judge for themselves, to separate from the Church to which they had belonged, and organize others without any regard to the theory requiring a "tactual succession," they were as well worthy of toleration or esteem as their French and German brethren. What, then, was the fact? Were *those* Non-Episcopal strangers acknowledged, and favored with church buildings to worship in? The proclamations and injunctions quoted in the last chapter enable us to answer the question. They were all required to unite with the English Church; or, if they claimed to be regarded

as sojourners, to join the Church of the Strangers, or else *to leave the country within twenty days!* How can this be accounted for on Mr. Goode's theory? We know not; but how it *is* to be explained we do know, and shall now state.

The very thing which he and his followers contend for, or which they represent as having been acknowledged, was most strenuously denied by all the Reformers. We mean the right to establish "new" or "particular" Churches. The common ground taken by all the leading men of the time was that the Church Catholic should be found everywhere, and that that portion of it which existed in each nation should be allowed to arrange its own affairs, provided nothing were done contrary to the word of God. On this principle the Church of France had no right to interfere with that of Germany, nor the Church of England with either. Each was so far independent of all others; but *individuals* were not independent. Every German, or Swiss, or Englishman was regarded as a member of the Church established in his own country, and separation from it was in no case sanctioned, unless that branch of the Church had utterly cast away the truth and imposed terms of communion that were sinful.

When Pollanus, A'Lasco and their associates went to England, then, they went not as individuals who had the right to set up "Churches" after their own fancy, but as regular members of those previously existing in their own land, and they were befriended by the English as sojourners or seekers of sanctuary. But the others, not claiming to belong to any National Church, separating from all that they might

have a system of doctrine and a ministry of their own, were treated as offenders against the unity and peace of the Christian Congregation. In so treating them England acted on the principle then held, as we have said, by all the Reformers.

This being so, when we find Mr. Goode or his followers stating that such and such laws or regulations were adopted as very proper for "an Episcopal Church,"* we are led to suspect that those writers are not so familiar with the doctrines and language of the time as they profess to be. We think it would be impossible for them to discover in a single document of importance within almost the whole of that century to which they so constantly refer, any such expression as "an Episcopal Church," or "the Presbyterian Church." The reason of this is, that *denominational* "Churches" were not then recognized or tolerated anywhere. Yet these are the very bodies for whose benefit Mr. Goode has written.

The laws, etc., quoted in the last chapter show conclusively that in Britain at least there was no allowance of what are now called "particular" Churches. No separation from the Christian Church as established by law was sanctioned for a moment, save in the case of those Germans or French who claimed protection from the persecutor, and who, while they sojourned in the land, were required to keep to themselves and use their own language. Outside the ministry which the Church of England regarded as Scriptural, no one was allowed to act as preacher

* See the replies of Dr. Canfield and others to Bishop Potter's Pastoral; also *Goode on Orders*, p. 83.

or Priest save those alien ministers whose services strictly limited to their own people.* The laws, we say, make this plain, and the history shows that the laws were enforced. From the days of Archbishop Parker to those of Archbishop Laud all sectaries and separatists were punished. This fact has been continually pressed as a powerful argument against the Church; therefore it cannot now be denied.

During the reign of Mary the Church had no existence as a free agent.

When the accession of Elizabeth opened the way once more to true religion, the authorities engaged immediately in the very work which, if Mr. Goode's theory were true, they would have scrupulously avoided. They took the greatest pains to preserve the Episcopal Order and the Apostolical Succession. Some of the Bishops were dead, some being heretical or criminal, were deprived, and others should of course be appointed in their place; but owing to the murder of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer and Hooper, it was doubtful whether a sufficient number of Bishops favorable to Reformation, could be found to give a valid and canonical consecration.† Among the Sees to be filled was that of Canterbury, the most important of all.

---

* Assertions to the contrary are very frequently and very confidently made, but as they are for the most part *general*, they are not worth noticing. Whenever anything like an actual instance is mentioned it can be dealt with. We shall presently consider, in their proper order, the few that have been brought forward.

† Bishop Short says, "against this evil a remedy had been provided by the providence of God: for there still existed several members of the Episcopal Order, who having fled beyond the sea and escaped the persecutions of Mary, became the instruments of continuing to our Church the Apostolical Succession of Bishops." (*History of Church of England*, Amer. Edit., p. 123.) We hope it is not necessary to inform the reader that Bishop Short is not a High Churchman!

For this the Queen and her advisers at once singled out the learned and admirable Dr. Matthew Parker, formerly chaplain to Anna Boleyn. He was unwilling to assume the responsibilities of the primacy, and so as a hostile writer (Sir James Mackintosh) says:

"A great part of the next year was employed in conquering the repugnance of this humble and disinterested man, to the highest dignity in the Reformed Churches."

We will allow Sir James to tell the story in his own words:

"When Cecil and Bacon had finally succeeded in overcoming his scruples, the consecration was delayed for some time, in order to take *such precautions as might best secure* ITS VALIDITY *from being impugned.* The Church of England then adopted and has not since renounced, the inconsistent and absurd opinion that the Church of Rome, though idolatrous, is the *only** channel through which all lawful power of ordaining Priests, of consecrating Bishops or validly performing any religious rite, flowed from Christ, through a succession of Prelates down to the latest age of the world. The ministers therefore first endeavored to obtain the concurrence of the [Roman] Catholic Bishops in the consecration: which those Prelates, who must have considered such an act as a profanation, conscientiously refused. They were at length obliged to issue a new commission, * * directed to Kitchen of Landaff, to Ball [Bale] an Irish Bishop, to Barlow, Scory and Coverdale deprived in the reign of Mary and to two Suffragans. Whoever considers it important at present to examine this list will perceive the perplexities in which the English Church was involved by a ZEAL TO PRESERVE UNBROKEN THE CHAIN OF EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION. On account of this frivolous advantage, that Church was led to prefer the common enemy of Reformation to those Protestant communions which had boldly snapped asunder that brittle chain."

The consecration finally took place in the Chapel at Lambeth, on the 17th of December, 1559, by Bishops Scory, Barlow, Coverdale and Hodgkins.

---

*Sir James is mistaken here. The Church never held any such idea. By the way, the reader will remember Mr. Goode's assertion that the doctrine of Succession originated with Archbishop Laud!

"All things were rightly and canonically performed [save that the giving of the pastoral staff was omitted], as may be seen in the register of Canterbury, and in the MSS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge." — (See full account in *Strype's Parker*, Vol. i., p. 113, etc.)

The importance of this regular consecration is shown by the fact that the Romanists endeavored to impugn it. Forty years after the event, they invented a story to the effect that the act was not performed in any place of worship, nor by properly consecrated persons, nor with proper ceremonies.

"Like good fellows, they made *themselves* Bishops at an inn [the Nag's Head tavern] because they could get no true Bishops to consecrate them."

If our author's theory were correct such an accusation as this would not have been regarded for a moment. The divines of our Church would certainly not have taken much trouble to disprove it. They would have said, "What if all this were true? We do not stand upon such points. The bishoprick is a mere office, and any formal appointment or installation is sufficient; we care nothing about what you call 'valid consecration,' we attach no importance to Succession!" But was this the way in which it was met? Every reader of Church history knows the contrary. The validity and regularity of the ordination were formally defended; the records were produced, and the "Nag's Head fable" exploded by Archbishop Abbot, Dr. Francis Mason, Archbishop Bramhall, Bishop Morton, and others. The particulars may be seen in Strype's Parker and Annals, in the histories of Fuller, Collier, Burnet, Carwithen and Short, and also in Heylin's Ecclesia Restaurata, at page 293, etc. Such then was the care taken by our Church to pre-

serve the Episcopal Order and the Apostolical Succession, such her promptitude in meeting a charge that was regarded as assailing the validity of all her ministrations.*

The English clergy who fled to the continent to escape the persecution under Mary, were repelled by the Lutherans, and this had the effect of throwing them among the divines of Geneva, Zurich and Strasburg. There, as was the case with Hooper, they became attached to the institutions, and accepted the doctrines of the Reformed. Some, like Cox, Horne, etc., were faithful to their own Church, but the majority were not, and when they returned to England they carried with them a feeling unfriendly to the discipline, the doctrine and the worship there maintained. They introduced a leaven of dissatisfaction which has been working ever since.†

As has been stated, the chief contest was then with Rome, and zeal against Romanism was the thing

* The point has since been yielded by Romanists themselves.—(See *Courayer's Defence of Anglican Ordinations.*)

† This fact has been denied, yet it cannot be by any one who has the least regard for the truth of history. Even the Latitudinarian Warner says: "The stricter sort *who had been exiles for religion*, could not comply with the terms of conformity."—(*Eccles. Hist.*, Vol. ii., p. 422; also *Hist. Brit. Non-Conformity*, p. 399.) The writer of the latter work says again: "Some of the new Bishops, who had been exiled for the faith of Christ, accepted their dignities with fear, as *they had pledged themselves to seek*, in the exercise of charity to others, *a further reformation* according to the Scripture!" (Page 400.) If a Church writer had accused those men of accepting bishopricks for the purpose of moulding the Church, as far as possible, after the Genevan model, it would be called slander; but this Non-Episcopal brother mentions it to their praise.

In the memorable oration of Hon. Rufus Choate [A. D., 1843], the following sentences occur: "There [at Geneva] they awaited the death of the Queen: and then, sooner or later, but in the time of Elizabeth, went back to England. *I ascribe to that five years in Geneva an influence that has changed the history of the world.*" When Mr. Barnes quoted this, the Episcopal Recorder said: "We have no disposition to tarnish in any degree the honors of Geneva. We would not ruffle a feather in the headdress with which she has been crowned." Neither would we!

most valued. Yet as it seems to us, it would have saved a world of trouble if more care had been taken to exclude from the Episcopal Order those who were not as firmly attached to their own Church as persons holding its highest trust should be. But owing to the incautious haste, or to the necessity of the authorities, the mitre was placed upon the heads of such men as Grindal, Parkhurst, and Pilkington; the consequence was that conformity to the laws and usages of the Church of England was not required in the dioceses they governed. They were obliged, indeed, to make occasional declarations against obstinate disturbers of the unity and peace of the Church, but their zeal was in word rather than in deed.

Archbishop Parker entered upon his office with a full sense of all that was required of him, and a conscientious determination to fulfil his duty as far as it was in his power. The Queen and Council had issued injunctions and proclamations touching unity of faith and worship, and special charges were given to him to see that these were observed; but he soon discovered that he could hope for no assistance from those who had acquired "Germanical natures." It is true that much irregularity might be looked for under all the circumstances, and also that much might exist even in the smallest diocese without the Bishop's knowledge.* But it is unfortunately too

* England of the sixteenth century must not be judged by what we know of England or the United States to-day. Imagine what a Bishop resident in New York would know of the affairs of a parish or the conduct of a minister away in Genesee county, if there were no railroads, or telegraphs, or newspapers, or communications by mail. No one could say what might be going on even a hundred miles off or less. We believe that while so many persons of unruly spirit were in the country, irregularities must have been frequent, but the Church is not responsible for them. They were violations of her law and usage, not tolerated, but unknown.

evident that the men above named were not fully disposed to carry out the laws.

On the 18th of November, 1560, Parker wrote to Grindal (then Bishop of London) concerning persons beneficed in his diocese, who were neither Priests nor Deacons. A year afterward he had to repeat the same inquiry, and again in 1567. The Queen, alarmed at the extent of the disorder and contention in the kingdom, wrote a reproving letter to the Archbishop, as if the blame were his. She says that

> "Through sufferance of sundry *varieties* and *novelties*, not only in opinions but also in external ceremonies and rites, there is crept and brought into the Church by some few persons abounding more in their own senses than wisdom would, and *delighting in singularities and changes*, an open and manifest disorder and offence to the godly, wise and obedient persons."

These troubles she judged likely "to breed some schism or deformity in the Church," and perceiving that lenience or indifference had rather caused them to increase "than to stay or diminish," she "straitly charged" him to proceed to enforce "the laws and ordinances provided by Act of Parliament;" so that "uniformity of order might be kept in every church without variety and contention."

The Primate wrote at once, giving similar charges to Grindal, but evidently without effect; for several weeks afterward he found it necessary to beg *privately* that a letter should be sent from her Majesty or Council to "my Lord of London," who without it would not proceed to execute the laws and injunctions, "and ye know," he says, "that *there* is the most disorder."

In another letter to Cecil, dated 8th March, he complained of Parkhurst, and expressed his surprise

that the charge had not been given to Grindal as he requested. Thus plainly intimating that "my Lord of London" continued obstinately to disobey orders, and that he had some friend at Court who secured him from censure. This friend was either Knollys or the ungodly Earl of Leicester, at that time the Queen's favorite.

During the same month the Archbishop wrote again to Cecil, complaining of the supineness of the civil authorities after all their censures upon him, and stating that not only clerical garments, but all rites were then being called in question. Again on the 7th of April 1565, he wrote that the factious persons openly claimed "my Lord of London" as their own, and that "my Lord of Durham (Pilkington*) will be against us all, and will give over his bishoprick rather than the law of conformity should be enforced in his diocese."

Again in November 1569, the Queen, through her Council, wrote to the Archbishop, upbraiding him for supposed diminution of care and diligence, whereby many were gone into dangerous errors or contemptuous license. This must have been peculiarly galling to the good old Primate, who had constantly begged in vain for their help in the executing of the laws. He had said in 1565 that much hurt would come through such "toleration," "the parties being hardened in their disobedience." Considering this,

---

* This is one of the "authorities" quoted by Mr. Goode. See his work, p. 31.

Bullinger to Beza.—"There are yet good hopes of some of them, for it appears that neither *my friend Parkhurst*, who holds the See of Norwich, nor *Pilkington*, who is Bishop of Durham, have as yet ejected any minister, nor, *indeed*, EVER INTEND TO DO SO." (*Zurich Letters*, ii., 144.)

then, it would be hard to understand how the Council could blame him for any irregularities, if we did not know that *puritanism had crept in even there*; even Bacon and Cecil were somewhat infected; Knollys was one of the most extreme of the party, and Leicester was "their Chancellor." There is little room for wonder, then, that the Primate was censured.

When Elizabeth asked, "Whence come these disorders?" The answer was, "The Bishops are remiss." When the malcontents asked, "Why are we not allowed to do as we please?" the answer was, "The Bishops are over-exact and cruel." But Parker saw through the scheme, and in his letter to Cecil (then Lord Burleigh) warned him of the evil that would come of it. "If this be a good policy *secretly* to work" against established law, "I (said the venerable Bishop) will not be a partaker of it."

"It is, *by too much sufferance*, past my reach, and, my brethren, the comfort that these Puritans have, and their continuance is marvellous; and, therefore, if her Highness, with her Council (I mean *some* of them), step not to it, *I see the likelihood of a pitiful Commonwealth* to follow. God have mercy upon us."

Again to the same purpose, as if endowed with the spirit of prophecy, he wrote,

"If this fond faction be applauded to or borne with, it will fall out to a popularity [or democracy], and as wise men think it will be the overthrow of all the nobility, *I fear ye shall feel Muncer's* COMMONWEALTH *attempted shortly.*"

Sixty-eight years afterward it was established.

We have dwelt longer on these matters than we should have done were it not necessary to show that through foreign refugees errors and disorders were brought in, that through the unfaithfulness of two or three puritanical bishops and courtiers they were

allowed to spread and increase, and that the true representatives of the Church exerted themselves to stem the current and prevent the evil they saw approaching.

The too common impression is that the Puritans were such good, meek Christians, that they quietly submitted to all hardships, and disobeyed only because conscience would not suffer them to yield compliance. Doubtless there were some of this stamp, but they were few in numbers, and borne helplessly along in the current, "rari nantes in gurgite vasto." The great body of them were simply self-willed and turbulent men, whose peculiar garb, affected manner, and apparent zeal for pure religion were merely the emblems of a party. Men of tender consciences do not enter the ministry and take oaths, and then deliberately break them; nor do they forge letters of Orders, or without ordination of any sort, represent themselves as clergymen, and hold office and draw salary for a series of years! * True Christians do not spend their time in strife and exciting dissatisfaction, in denouncing and opposing those that are over them in the Lord, or violating the sanctity of God's house and worship. Yet these and other such things were done by those who are even yet lauded as men of unusual godliness, whose only fault was that they did not like the surplice, or the sign of the cross in Baptism!

This is not the place to correct such erroneous impressions, but we cannot help inviting the readers

* Archbishop Parker to Archbishop Grindal, of York, 17 March, 1574–5: "You think it will fall hardly with him who hath exercised spiritual jurisdiction these fifteen or sixteen years, and thereupon *you writ to stay*, if any suit should be made for him *to escape* by faculty, your Grace shall understand that seeing you have sent me warning of it in time, I do not intend to gratify his friends thereby; nor yet to favor the suit that might be made unto me out of Carlisle," etc.—(*Parker's Cor.*, 474.)

attention to what he will find on a single leaf of Archbishop Parker's Correspondence.

Certain precisians complained to the government that they could not have the holy sacrament administered in the parish churches, though on one occasion six hundred persons met for that purpose. To this the Archbishop replied that he knew nothing of the facts, but he *did* know that the Churchwardens in many parishes, for the purpose of making trouble and difficulty, provided "neither surplice nor bread," and that those

> "Precise men for all their brag of six hundred communicants did profess openly that they would neither communicate nor come in the Church where either the surplice or the cap is."

And further, he tells Cecil, that on the previous Sunday one of his chaplains was in the act of administering Holy Communion, or rather "reading the passion," when a man of the parish snatched the elements from the table "because the bread was not common," and so the minister was derided and the devout communicants disappointed. Again, he says one Crowley (incumbent of St. Giles) was complained of for a quarrel or stir which he had made in his own church with some clerks who went there in their surplices to bury a corpse; he quarreled with the choristers for their "porter's coats," and called the "surplice man" a wolf! The Archbishop saw that he was desirous of a mild martyrdom, wishing to be sent to prison, so he "dulled his glory" by confining him to his own house, and giving his parish to another.

But as if this were not disorder enough for a single letter to report, the writer adds that there were some in prison "*who in this quarrel fell to open blows in the*

Church! (pp. 277–8.)* Such were some of the acts of men who began by objecting to clerical vestments and other matters of no essential importance, but went on to open contempt of everything that was not in accordance with their own novel fancies. From arguing against the office of Archbishops and the dignity and wealth of Prelates in general, they proceeded to attack the whole Episcopal Order. The next step was to claim exclusive divine right for their own system, and to denounce the Church as a "synagogue of Satan." The next, when they had the power, was to overthrow the Church, turn its revenues to their own use, expel all Bishops and Clergy, and murder the Primate.

Apropos of these men, we refer the reader to our author's representation of their principles. He says:

"It must not be forgotten that the object of the *early* Nonconformists was not the mere toleration of their own system, but the utter subversion of the system of Church government then established." — (Page 42, note.)

Here again he is mistaken. Nonconformity was thirty years old before its adherents took such ground; indeed the more moderate among them never did take it. The most extreme of the *early* Nonconformists never went farther than to say that Episcopacy is an institution of man, and that a Bishop is of the same Order as a Presbyter,† which is precisely the doctrine of Mr. Goode!

* All these extracts, etc., are from Archbishop Parker's Correspondence. —(*Parker, Soc. Ed.*)

† Archbishop Parker died May, 1575. In 1573 Cartwright contended for parity and against all Archbishops. In 1585 the anonymous libellers calling themselves "Mar Prelates," began to attack the whole Episcopal Order, and in such style as clergymen have never been spoken of since the days of the Apostles. In 1558 a classis of Separatists in

We turn now to the cases of those who have been named as holding preferment in the English Church, though having only Presbyterian Orders. Of these the first is

WHITTINGHAM. — While in exile he was "ordained" in the English congregation at Geneva.* He was associated with John Knox in the attempt to impose the Genevan system upon the English Church at Frankfort. After his return to England he was appointed, *through the influence of Leicester*, to the Deanery of Durham, where Pilkington was Bishop. The latter made no investigation as to his being in regular Orders or not, so he was allowed to hold his lucrative and honorable position. Yet even there he could not behave himself as others did; his Nonconformity attracted attention, and he was suspended for a time, although Bishop Pilkington tried to shield him. When Pilkington died in 1576, his successor [Barnes] called the Church there "an Augean Stable," referring to the total neglect of regularity, etc., among the Clergy. Archbishop Sandys, of York, in his visitation, 1576–7, observed these disorders, and while investigating them learned "that Whittingham was no ordained minister according to the Order of the Church of England." A special commission was

---

Warwickshire went the full length. They "unchurched" the Church, decreeing that Bishops have no proper authority, that no duty [or respect] is due to them, and that it is *not lawful* to receive ordination at their hands. To the same purpose were many subsequent declarations and resolutions, as for instance, that ninety years later, when certain persons arrested in a conventicle and brought before Sir John Lenthal, declared that they would not obey the laws, for they were not true laws, nor conform to the Church, for it was not a true Church, that there was "no true Church but where the faithful met." They of course were the faithful.

* He married Calvin's sister.

appointed to adjudicate upon the case, to whom the Archbishop stated that

"It was not lawful for Whittingham to hold that Deanery in respect of his defect therein, and that he was worthy of deprivation because his ministry was not warranted by the law of the land, being ordained by a *few lay-persons at Geneva.*"* It was further charged that Whittingham was "neither Deacon nor Priest according to law, but *a mere layman.*" To this he replied that he was indeed neither Deacon nor minister according to the order and law of the realm, "but ordered in Queen Mary's time in Geneva, according to the form there used."

Even of this he could show no proof. He presented a certificate of *election* to the office of preaching, etc., in the English Congregation. This was all he had to show, and so his case was lost. The Lord President (Huntington), who evidently sympathized with him, wrote to Burleigh expressing his unwillingness to have him deprived as a mere layman, saying,

"It could not but be ill taken in all the Reformed Churches abroad, that we should allow of the Popish massing Priests in our ministry, and disallow of ministers made in a Reformed Church."

Nevertheless, deprived he would have been had not his death prevented it.†

A zealous advocate of Puritanism thinks he finds even in Archbishop Sandys's course an endorsement

---

* The puritanical Hutton, then Dean of York, expressed the opinion that he "was in better sort ordained than our ministers in England, and that his ministry was much better than the Archbishop's was!"

† This President's decision was adverse to Archbishop Sandys, as may be guessed from the letter to Cecil, but the process went on, and the case was *sub judice* when Whittingham died. Above we have the judgment of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which is certainly definitive. Notwithstanding the easily ascertained facts of the case, the Rev. Mr. Gallagher says "when Whittingham produced his Geneva certificate, the Lord President dismissed the Council, saying that he could not in conscience consent to deprive him for that cause only." This is represented as the conclusion of the matter.—(*True Churchmanship*, p. 33.)

of Presbyterian Orders! He claims that their validity was acknowledged in the very charge that Whittingham had not proved that he had been made minister according to the order established at Geneva. But this is strange logic. Was not the *first* step to demand proof that there had been *any ordination at all*, and if anything of the kind could be shown, *then* to question its lawfulness or validity? But Whittingham's case did not endure the first test; no evidence of ordination by any mode was presented, and therefore there was no necessity to say another word. The same author supposes that there is a still stronger acknowledgment in Sandys's letter to Burleigh (*Strype's Annals*, iv., p. 620):

"The discredit of the Church of Geneva is hotly alleged. Verily, my Lord, that Church is not touched; for he hath not received his ministry in that Church * * * so far as yet can appear."

On this the writer we refer to remarks:

"His Grace could only deny the *fact* of Presbyterian ordination; he could not call in question its *validity*."

How is this known? There was no occasion to call it in question. But if there had been, it would have been done. How is it possible to infer from the sentence above that if Whittingham had presented evidence of his having had the hands of Calvin and his colleagues laid upon him, the Archbishop would yield the case, and say "that is sufficient?" Far otherwise would it have been. Such an ordination could not and would not have been allowed; but as the question would necessarily have occasioned ill feeling, it was kept back as long as possible.*

* The writer here referred to is Dr. S. Hopkins, whose work on the Puritans, in three large octavo volumes, we consider a credit to the

There was, however, a much stronger plea in his favor than that of a Genevan ordination, viz: that subsequently mentioned by Whitgift — NECESSITY: "*In time of persecution he was ordained minister by them that had authority in the Church persecuted,*"* and yet "had he lived he would have been deprived," unless he was granted a special dispensation, which would entitle him only to receive the temporalities of his office—not to perform clerical duties.—(*Strype's Whitgift*, fol., p. 252.)

So this case is disposed of. The next is that of TRAVERS, whom Mr. Goode styles the "notorious Puritan." This man was lecturer at the Temple, while the illustrious RICHARD HOOKER was its Master. His inordinate zeal for Calvinistic doctrine and Genevan usages led him into controversy with Hooker, which attracted attention to his course, and bred so much contention that Archbishop Whitgift silenced him. He then wrote to the Lord Treasurer, begging to have this suspension removed, and in the questioning that followed it was found that he had

country in this age. We by no means agree with Dr. H. as to the character of the Puritans, nor [as may be seen above] do we accept his deductions from the authorities he cites; but in these days of trashy little compends, or books filled with quotations at second hand (or even twenty-second hand), it is refreshing to meet with a work in which we have something more than scissors and paste can produce. Dr. Hopkins has read for himself, and his book shows a much larger acquaintance with even Church chronicles than many of our Episcopalian writers possess.

* Our Author's use of this quotation from Archbishop Whitgift is not of such a character as to impress us very favorably. It does not seem to justify what has been said of his "candor, impartiality, and profound regard for the whole truth." He says [p. 85–6] Whitgift "did not deny the validity of Presbyterian Orders in the abstract," for "he admits that Whittingham 'was ordained minister by those that *had authority in the Church*' IN WHICH HE WAS ORDAINED!" Thus suggesting the Genevan, or Presbyterian, and not the Church of England "*persecuted*," of which the Archbishop spoke. He skilfully stops his quotation at the word "Church," and makes the addition that suits his theory.

only Presbyterian Orders, whereupon he was notified that without re-ordination he could not again be permitted to exercise any ministerial functions.

"But he, taking it for granted that his ordination, received in a congregation of the Reformed Church, from the hands of Reformed Ministers, was lawful and good, argued that he ought not to be ordained again to qualify him to perform his calling of preaching the Gospel."—(*Strype's Whitgift*, p. 251.)

He argued that as the Church of God is ONE, those who were duly ordained in one branch thereof ought to be received in all. The Archbishop granted the principle, but denied its application, and reminded him that it was not acted upon by those who favored presbyteries. He further claimed to be as legally entitled to exercise his ministry as "*many Scottish men and others* made ministers abroad," and formally acknowledged and employed as such in England. To this the Archbishop answered, "*I know none such.*" His next point was, that up to the thirteenth year of Elizabeth's reign, even Popish Priests were allowed to enter the Church, and when a certain system was established to prevent evil from this, they were not required to be re-ordained, but merely to subscribe the Articles in testimony of their assent to the Church's doctrine — as if he would say, "Since THEY were so favorably dealt with, what favor ought not to be shown to *orthodox* ministers?" To this the Archbishop answered: "When the like Act is made for his ministry, then he may allege it."

This, we should suppose, would settle all question as to the sense of that law, or the interpretation put on it by the authorities of the Church at the time it was made. But Mr. Goode knows better than the Primate. He says:

"The parties more particularly in the eye of the framers of the Act were *probably* (!) those ordained by the Romish form, but the application of the clause was *of course* general."—(Pp. 47, 48.*)

It might be supposed, from such a statement, that the Reverend gentleman had never read the decision in Travers's case, but we find him referring to it on page 85. The only ground, then, on which he can have set forward a judgment of his own so contrary to that decision, is that he believes himself better able to understand the application of a law drawn up in Elizabeth's days than a Prelate who had for years administered it!

It seems hardly necessary to repeat (our Author to the contrary notwithstanding) that the benefit of the clause referred to, though always claimed by the Puritans, was never granted. It gave liberty to enter the Church by mere subscription, etc., to those who had been ordained by a different *form*. Why, then, were they rejected, except on the ground that they had not been ordained at all? The fact of their being denied the benefit of the Act has always been pointed to as a cruelty or sort of breach of faith; it is therefore confessed by themselves, and so put beyond the power of denial now. (See *Oldmixon's History*.)

Travers referred also to the case of Whittingham, and stated that he himself had been allowed [by Archbishop Grindal] to act as minister for nearly six years, and ought therefore still to be allowed. To all this the Primate answered that he had no claim whatever, that he was not lawfully made minister; for

* This is also claimed by Rev. Dr. Canfield, who seems to think that previous to that date Romish priests were re-ordained when received into our Church.

"Misliking the Order of his own country, he ran to be ordered elsewhere *by such as had* NO AUTHORITY TO ORDAIN HIM. That the case of Whittingham was different from his, for Whittingham had received the best ordination he could at the time, whereas '*he in time of peace*, refusing to be made minister at home, gadded to other countries to be ordained by *such as had no authority.*' And further, that to speak of his being so long permitted to preach was to abuse their patience—*that he "never allowed of that kind of calling, neither* COULD *he allow of it.*"

This decision of itself should settle the whole controversy. Archbishop Whitgift declared that he, the Primate, COULD NOT ALLOW such Orders, as they were not allowed by the law of the Church, or of the realm. Yet this was the Bishop of whom, on page 85, Mr. Goode says he "*admitted the* VALIDITY *of the Orders of the Foreign Protestant Churches!*" Comment on such a statement is unnecessary.

MORRISON.—We now come to the other case generally quoted as sufficient to prove the recognition of Presbyterian Orders. It is the ONLY instance Mr. Goode brings forward to substantiate his assertion that for *a hundred years* such Orders were judged sufficient by the authorities of our Church!

Our author says:

"In 1582 (April 6), a license was granted by the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury (Grindal) to a minister of the name of John Morrison, who had only Scotch Orders, in the following terms:

"'Since you, the aforesaid John Morrison, about five years past, in the town of Garvet, in the county of Lothian, of the kingdom of Scotland, were admitted and ordained to Sacred Orders and the holy ministry, by the imposition of hands, according to the laudable form and rite of the Reformed Church of Scotland; and since the congregation of that county of Lothian is *conformable to the orthodox faith and sincere religion* now received in *this realm of England, and established by public authority;* we, therefore, as much as lies in us, and as by right we may, approving and ratifying the form of your ordination and preferment (præfectionis) done in such manner aforesaid, grant to you a license and faculty, with the consent and express

command of the most Reverend Father in Christ the Lord Edmund, by the Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, to us signified, that in such Orders by you taken, you may, and have power, in any convenient places in and throughout the whole province of Canterbury, to celebrate divine offices, to minister the sacraments, etc., as much as in us lies, and we may de jure, and as far as the laws of the kingdom do allow,'" etc. (*Strype's Life of Grindal*, Folio, Bk. ii., c. xiii., p. 271; or Oxford ed., p. 402.)

The first thing we observe in connection with this is, a disingenuous omission. He copies the whole from Strype, but takes care to omit what that honest chronicler took care to insert. Strype says he sets down this license because it was "*somewhat* UNUSUAL." Mr. Goode leaves out this statement and prints the license, to prove that it was *not at all unusual*, but a perfectly lawful and common thing!

We next remark, that our author does not state explicitly that Morrison had been ordained by a Presbytery. He says he "had only SCOTCH Orders"—which is precisely the case with almost every *Episcopal* minister in Scotland. But, though not said, it is plainly implied, that the person licensed was neither more nor less than a Presbyterian Minister.* We doubt this. There is no *positive* evidence on the subject one way or the other. Probabilities must determine, and by them we are led to believe that John Morrison had received Episcopal ordination. Our reasons are these.

The license was granted in the spring of 1582, and it is stated that he was ordained to Sacred Orders about five years before. This would make the date either 1576 or 1577. We have already seen that

* In this the Reverend gentleman, whether knowingly or not, follows the Presbyterian, Dr. Miller, and the Methodist, Mr. Powell.

there was no opposition whatever to Bishops as such in Scotland until 1575, when Andrew Melville, fresh from Geneva, began to preach up simple Presbyterianism. It was in the General Assembly of that year that the question was first mooted "whether Bishops, as they are now in Scotland, have their functions in the word of God." It is not to be supposed that the whole Episcopate of the Church of Scotland melted away like a vapor almost as soon as this question was proposed. We have proof to the contrary. The battle between the conservatives and the innovators was long and obstinately fought, and with varying fortunes, and it was only in 1587, that the latter succeeded in getting an Act which gave the Presbyteries jurisdiction in their respective districts. Prior to that time, then, the Bishop was the ordinary and sole authority, and even in those dioceses which had no Bishops, the general control and the right of ordination were given by law to the Superintendents. Consequently, a Presbytery had no legal right to ordain prior to the year just mentioned. But Morrison's admission to the ministry took place years before, and the presumption of course is that he was properly ordained by a Bishop.

This presumption is strengthened by the wording of the document. If in the bitter strife of the times the Church in Lothian had taken sides against Episcopacy and cast it away, it certainly could not be said to be "*conformable* to the orthodox faith and *sincere religion* received in this realm of England and *established by public authority*." Considering the special significance at that time of the word "conform" and all its derivatives, we think it in the highest degree

improbable that it could be applied to those whose course was as bad, or worse, than that of the *Non-conformists.*

But further. The license professes to be given so far as "we may *de jure* and as far as the laws of the kingdom do allow." But no law allowed such a license to be granted to any but regularly ordained men, and so upon these several grounds we infer that the ordination of John Morrison was not Presbyterian, but regular, that is, Episcopal!

But suppose the contrary should be shown—suppose that in the document itself he was plainly described as being precisely what Mr. Goode and others represent him,* would it follow that the granting of such a license involved the Church's acknowledgment of the validity of Non-Episcopal Orders? Not at all. The act of an individual, however exalted, is not the act of the Church, unless it is done in the regular manner, and in accordance with unquestioned laws and principles. Our author has not attempted to show that the granting of such a license to a Presbyterian would have been warranted in law; and, if not legal, what could it prove?

We assert and will show, however, that it was entirely illegal. Presuming that the party concerned had been regularly ordained, the law required that he should bring his letters dismissory from the Bishop whose diocese he had left. Mere "Letters of Orders," under the hand and seal of a Bishop, would not suffice; nor would a dismissory letter or

* Mr. Goode says "he had only Scotch Orders." Mr. Gallagher does not mince matters thus; following Dr. Miller, he styles him a "Scotch Presbyterian minister."—(See *True Churchmanship*, p. 32.)

certificate of good standing, if signed by a Chancellor or any other but the Bishop himself. Yet the license before us makes no reference to any letters dismissory; it professes to be given simply because the person had been ordained about five years before. Presuming, then, that Morrison had been properly commissioned, licensing him, without the usual dismissory or commendatory letters of his Bishop, was altogether irregular and illegal.

But still more overwhelming is the proof of its unlawfulness, if he had not Episcopal Orders. We request the reader to look back to the last chapter, and consider the laws guarding the entrance to, and exercise of, the ministry. They required every one desiring to be ordained Deacon to be twenty-three years of age, a graduate of a University or otherwise sufficiently learned, well approved and vouched for, as to his personal character, by those clergymen who put him forward, and sanctioned by the people among whom he dwelt. Then, if satisfactory in all these respects, and if a living or a "title" were presented he might be ordained, and, after the lapse of a year and further examination, he might be advanced to the priesthood. Yet even then he was not allowed to exercise that right to preach the Gospel which is an essential part of the ministerial office. The fundamental law of license was,

"That none be permitted to preach, or interpret the Scriptures, unless he be a Priest, or a Deacon at the least, admitted thereunto *according to the laws of this realme.*"

But the times required still greater strictness. Properly ordained persons, however, could get the special license by showing that they had the learning

and ability necessary, and that they were completely orthodox and perfectly "conformable" to the laws and usages of the Church; but, lacking these requisites, they could not procure them, except by dishonorable connivance.

So strict were the enactments, that no regularly ordained minister could legally officiate, even once, in any but his own church, without giving to the minister and wardens sufficient evidence of his being a true and duly licensed Minister.* For presuming to preach without the necessary qualification and permission the punishment was severe, and it was hardly less severe for giving Orders or license to improper persons. Yet here we have a document by which full ministerial authority and privilege were given to a man who certainly was not admitted to any function of the ministry, according to the laws of that Church or realm; who had presented no testimonials of the kind required by law; who had given no hostages whatever to the Church. For his benefit the entire system of ecclesiastical law and usage had been ignored; and this high-handed violation of right is quoted as proof of *the Church's recognition of Non-Episcopal Orders!*

---

* See laws in last chapter; also the following, as bearing upon the case before us:

"That none be permitted to preach or interpret the Scriptures, unless he be a *Priest*, or a *Deacon* at the least [a Presbyterian minister was neither], admitted thereunto according to the laws of this realm."

"Whether there be any persons that intrude themselves and presume to exercise any ministry in the Church of God, *without imposition of hands* and *ordinary* authority;" "or whether any minister do remove from any other diocese to serve in this without letters testimonial of the ordinary from whom he came, to testify the cause of his departing thence, and of his behaviour."—(*Archbishop Parker's Visit. Articles*, 1569, *Strype's Parker*; also *Cardwell's Documentary Annals*, vol. i., p. 357; *Ibid.*, 407, etc.

By whom was that license given? Mr. Goode mentions the name, but is very careful to say no more. He does not even tell why the license was issued by a "Vicar-General." We will supply the defect. Archbishop Grindal, at whose "express command" the paper was written, was himself *at that time under suspension* (or sequestration) *for connivance at irregularities.*

We have seen how he neglected or refused to administer the laws in his diocese of London, and how, when Archbishop of York, he endeavored to shield some who, in reference to the ministry, violated all rule and propriety. Now, as Primate, he was no more careful. He was directed to suppress certain meetings, called "prophesyings," and declined doing so. He was again directed, but, in place of obeying, he remonstrated, and was then suspended. Those "exercises" or "prophesyings" were attempts at evasion of the law. We are told that they began in Scotland. In England their first use was for the improvement of the Clergy among themselves; but they were seized upon by those who had been silenced for nonconformity, etc., and made a means of reaching the people, as well as of holding controversy with regular ministers. They engaged in preaching and prayers, and even the administration of Sacraments, all without any authority and contrary to law.

Grindal expressed his willingness to interfere so far as to *check*, but not to suppress the assemblies. But that course had been tried ineffectually by his predecessor; and in any case, as Archbishop Sandys said, the thing, though it might be good in itself, yet ought not to be encouraged, since it was an innova-

tion, wholly unauthorized. The first step would have been to have had it legalized. Grindal, in his own injunctions of 1576, acknowledges that

"Divers Ministers, deprived from their livings and inhibited to preach, for not obeying the public orders and discipline of the Church of England, have intruded themselves to be speakers in the said exercises, and, being excluded from pulpits, have in the said exercises usually made their invections against the Orders, rites, and discipline of the Church."

Dr. Cardwell says:

"Laymen were allowed to take part in the debates; nonconforming ministers were allowed also; occasion had been taken to attack the character of individuals, public and private; speeches had been made against the established government and services of the Church, and some speakers had shown themselves ill affected toward the State."—(*Doc. Annals*, Vol. i., p. 422.)

Still the Primate would not suppress those disorderly debating societies, and so he was sequestrated; and while under this disability he gave the license to John Morrison!* It is not necessary to add another word upon the subject.

Thus, then, we have disposed of all the cases generally referred to as proving that our Church recognized Non-Episcopal Orders.

The only other item of evidence which Mr. Goode has offered for his boast of a hundred years is a general statement made in a supposed letter of Bishop Cosin to some M. Cordel, and also by Bishop Fleetwood (A. D. 1712). They are to the same effect, viz:

"We had many ministers from Scotland, from France, and the Low Countries, who were ordained by Presbyters only, and

* We do not wish to be severe or uncharitable. Grindal was evidently a good man, but he was not heartily reconciled in all respects to his own Church, and so far was an unfaithful Bishop. We are sure that he acted conscientiously, but we are no less sure that he acted improperly.

not Bishops, and they were instituted into benefices with cure * * * and yet were never re-ordained, but only subscribed the Articles."—(*Bishop Fleetwood in Goode on Orders*, p. 47.)

To this we reply that Bishop Fleetwood was writing of what took place a hundred years before his time, and could not, therefore, give *evidence*. If he had any records, etc., to justify his assertion, he should have referred to or produced them. Without original authorities to sustain him, he can no more be heard than Mr. Goode himself.

As to Bishop Cosin (if the letter be really his), though he had somewhat better means of knowing, he points to no records or well-known cases. And after all to what could he testify? To irregularities only. The laws are explicit, and they are before our eyes. If the Parkhursts or Pilkingtons of a later date admitted men in opposition to those laws, their so doing was not the Church's act but their own. So that if the facts were as stated above, it would prove nothing more than a disgraceful laxity on the part of the Bishops, who, in spite of the Canons, received unqualified persons into their dioceses.

And now we beg leave to offer some evidence of the opposite character, something that will put Fleetwood's statement, and that attributed to Cosin, in the class of mere "tradition and hearsay."

In the "proposed alterations" of the (English) Book of Common Prayer (A. D. 1689), which are in every important particular the same as the paper of "Concessions" drawn up by the then Dean Tillotson (See *Birch's Life of Tillotson*, pp. 168–9), we find a plain declaration, which, coming from men who were at the time the highest officials in the Anglican

Church, and as such had the best possible opportunity of knowing all the facts, is of vastly greater value than the opinion or statement of any individual. In this formal document, the Bench of Bishops, or rather the Commissioners appointed under the Great Seal* (in furtherance of the policy for which most of them were advanced to the Episcopate †), proposed as follows:

"Seeing the Reformed Churches abroad are in that imperfect state that they CANNOT *receive ordination from Bishops*, it is humbly proposed whether they may not be received by an imposition of hand in these, or such like words, 'Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in this Church, as thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.

"Whereas it has been the *constant practice of the Ancient Church to allow no ordination of Priests* (i. e. Presbyters) *or Deacons without a Bishop*, and that it has likewise been the CONSTANT PRACTICE OF THIS CHURCH EVER SINCE THE REFORMATION to allow none that *were not ordained of Bishops, where they could be had;* yet in regard that several in this kingdom have of late years been *ordained only by Presbyters*, the Church, being desirous to do all that can be done for peace, and

---

* Among the commissioners were Lamplugh, Compton, Sprat, Burnet and other Bishops, also Stillingfleet, Patrick, Tillotson, Sharpe, Beveridge, Tenison, and four others, who were subsequently rewarded by elevation to the Episcopal bench. Historians say that "Tillotson, Burnet, Tenison, and all the men of that school" were willing to waive the question of Presbyterian Orders by adopting a course similar to that used in the ancient Church in reference to "those who had been ordained by heretics." Yet Burnet seems to disclaim this. He says, "We had before us *all the books and papers that they* the [Non-Episcopalians] *had at any time offered, setting forth their demands*, together with many advices and propositions which had been made at several times * * * * so we prepared a Scheme to be laid before the Convocation, BUT *did not think that we, ourselves*, much less that any other person, *was any way limited or bound to comply* with what we resolved to propose." For an account of this whole business see Lathbury's valuable *History of Convocation*, p. 320., etc., etc.

† That English clergymen have sometimes been promoted to the higher Order for the purpose of carrying out a certain policy favored by the Government, is too well known to require proof. A very *naive* acknowledgment of the fact in his own case was made by the late Bishop Stanley of Norwich.—(See *his life etc., by his son, the present Dean Stanley*).

in order to the healing of our dissensions, *has thought fit to receive such as have been ordained by Presbyters only*, TO BE ORDAINED *according to this office*, with the addition of these words, 'If they shall not have been ordained already.' "—(See *Proctor on Book of Common Prayer*, p. 157).

Let it be borne in mind that the persons who made this formal acknowledgment, and who begged as a favor for Nonconformists or Dissenters that which Mr. Goode represents as having been freely granted to them as a right for a whole century, were the so-called "Latitudinarian" divines, who were certainly the best friends that Non-Episcopalians ever had in the English Church.* If they had known of any such liberty as Mr. Goode speaks of, would they not have stated the fact and made it the basis of argument or appeal? In place of such assertion or argument, however, we have the plain acknowledgment that the "constant practice" of the Church "ever since the Reformation" had been to exclude those who were not Episcopally ordained. And we see that the greatest length to which these extra-liberal divines were willing to go falls far short of Mr. Goode's representation. The favor they ask for their dissenting friends is *not* that they may be admitted on account of their Presbyterian "ordination," but that when they come in due course to be

* "They were attached to the form of Church Government and the mode of public worship established by the laws of England, and they recommended them exclusively to others, yet they would not have it believed that *these* were of divine institution and absolutely necessary." (*Reed's edition of Murdock's Mosheim*, p. 830.) Here Mosheim has confounded things that are not at all similar. No person ever contended that the *mode of worship* was of divine institution, so that on that point the persons alluded to had no opponent. As to the other, their failure at the time and the odium that has ever since attached to the name of "Latitudinarian," show plainly how the Church regarded their attempt to change its fundamental principles.

ordained by a Bishop he may insert a hypothetical clause! *

We need not remind the reader that these "proposals" were never acceded to—it is not so well known, however, that they were never presented. They were skilfully drawn up for the purpose of being brought into Convocation. They were well considered and backed by all the influence of the Court, yet never submitted to the House. This fact speaks volumes. It shows that the Government party was in antagonism to the Church, and however powerful it might be, its numbers were still so few that their defeat was certain if they had endeavored to introduce a measure even so far revolutionary. The temper of the House was shown by its emphatically rejecting Tillotson and choosing Dr. Jane as Prolocutor, and by the significant words in which he closed his inaugural address "*nolumus leges Angliæ mutari.*" These things and the struggle of the next few days showed the concessionists that the Church would not sanction their course, and so, as Proctor says, "they did not venture to submit their proposals to the Convocation, it being *quite certain that they would be rejected?*"

---

* It should also be borne in mind that in making these proposals the Commissioners expressly declare that *even they would not sanction them as a general rule.* After suggesting the hypothetical form they say:

"By which as she *retains her opinion and practice which make a* BISHOP *necessary to the giving of Orders when he can be had,* so she does likewise leave all such persons as have been ordained by Presbyters only, the freedom of their own thoughts concerning their former ordinations. It being withal *expressly provided, that this shall* NEVER BE PRECEDENT for ye time to come and yt shall only be granted to such as have been ordained before the —— day of ——."

The Editor of the N. Y. "Christian Times," who reprints this document, says quite truly that this project had never been entertained before, but he errs when he states that in 1689 "*it fell through for lack of time!* It was in course of formation, or subject of thought and effort for five years at least. We have given in the text the true reason why it was, as he says, "never even reported to the Convocation."

Thus it is seen that neither compliant Bishops, nor a Presbyterian King could induce the representatives of the Church to admit any change which would involve surrender of its distinctive principles.

The *animus* of the Government was displayed by the course it pursued in interfering with the Convocation and finally withdrawing its license in 1717, from which time, until very recently, no permission was granted to engage in synodical action. The alien Government (administered by Dutch William and his Hanoverian successors) had little regard for the Church of England. And, as the Convocation would not betray its trust, that Government doomed it to silence. For one hundred and fifty years it was not allowed to deliberate or to speak. But now, at last, thank God,* the restriction has been taken off, and we may hear again the VOICE OF THE CHURCH.

As to the law and the practice since 1662, there is no debate. Our author yields the point, confessing that both are exclusive. And he thinks this perfectly right, inasmuch as every Church has power to regulate its own affairs! Thus he classes the arrangement of the sacred ministry among things indifferent.†

* The writer's thankfulness is not for anything Convocation has done since it was left free to consult and speak, but for the point gained in the removal of the gag. Far better pleased would we be if every province in Great Britain should hold a synod every year, and then once in three or five years the National Convocation of delegates from the various dioceses would assemble in the Capital. We do not consider that that body as now constituted properly represents the Church, still it is greatly better than no synod at all.

† In this also he is dutifully followed by some at least of his American disciples, but he is much more prudent or more precise in his use of words than they. He would be the last man to say that Episcopacy is a ceremony! We never saw it so described until Mr. Gallagher's pamphlet fell

For this attempt at explanation we care very little. The fact which he acknowledges is quite sufficient. We are therefore are at liberty to assert that, at this very day the law IS what he labors to prove that it *is not*, and further, that it has been the same (even on his own admission) for at least two hundred years, and that throughout the whole of that period the practice has been in complete accordance with the law.

His only ground for maintaining that the doctrine of the Church is really in harmony with his theory is (as the reader will remember), that in 1662 certain changes were made by what he calls "the Laudean divines, who then had the upper hand." In opposition to this, we have shown, in the last two chapters, that no such changes were made in the formularies and laws, and that his statement regarding the introduction of new matter in the Preface to the Ordinal is a *suggestio falsi*, utterly unworthy of any candid reasoner.* (2) We have also shown,

---

into our hands, but therein (page 38) that gentleman so refers to it and even quotes Saravia, as if *he* supposed the difference between Non-Episcopalians and us to be a mere matter "*of external rites!*"

* The statement here referred to has been made directly in *five* places, viz., pages 18, 19, and 48, and twice on page 83; it is also *implied* in several other places. As a matter of course, the more zealous among Mr. Goode's American followers accept and repeat it. Thus Dr. Canfield says, "The Laudean party under Charles II. *asked for a change*," which was granted! The Rev. Mr. Gallagher also mentions the "changes in the Ordinal," and speaks repeatedly of the "innovations" of Laud and his party. It is gratifying to find, however, that persons of more reasonable spirit and more exact information use very different language. Thus the Rev. Dr. Smith, says: "This Preface stands now substantially as it has ever since the Reformation. Some changes of expression were introduced into it in 1661, but *in its actual requirements it has remained unaltered.*"—(See *Reply to Bishop H. Potter, Church Monthly*, July, 1865.)

In the same spirit the editor of the Christian Times says, in his issue for July 20, 1865:

"It has been thought that the clause added to the Ordinal, in 1662, introduced a new qualification." "The words in italics ['or *hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination*'] were added at that time.

on his own authority, that if the Laudean divines had desired to make any such alterations in the formularies, "the power was *not* in their hands."* (3) And now, in this chapter, we have proved that in the practice of the Church, in connection with the subjects we are discussing, there has been no change whatever.† Consequently, to use an expression of

---

But this was nothing new, for the Ordinal, as previously established, in 1549, said, 'To the intent these Orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England, it is requisite that no man (*not being at this present Bishop, Priest, or Deacon*) shall execute any of them, except he be tried, examined, and admitted according to the form hereinafter following." Here we have in a parenthesis the same thing in effect. And to say that this clause was designed to unchurch all Non-Episcopal bodies is useless, because the view was not held by those who made the amendment. *It is clear that the law itself experienced* NO *essential change* at the hands of the Laudeans, On the contrary, from the beginning it was actually relaxed. In the Ordinal of 1549, 'it is declared that *no* man, not already Bishop, Priest, or Deacon,' shall execute any function of said offices, 'except he be called, tried, examined or admitted *according to the form hereinafter following.*' How USELESS is it, then, to say, that while this clause of the Ordinal stood, the Non-Episcopalians could *lawfully* hold the offices and enjoy the emoluments of the Church of England!"

* Goode on Baptism, American edition, page 480. In our eleventh chapter we shall show further, that the persons called Laudean divines by our author (or those to whom such a title could with any sort of reason be applied) did not hold the exclusive views that he says it is "certain" they did. They are represented by him in one place as the most extreme of all Episcopalians in their doctrine on the point now debated, yet elsewhere he tries to show that they were as liberal as himself. The truth is that they were no more "exclusive," and no more "loose" or "liberal," than the Church to which they belonged.

† We cannot refrain from printing here the valuable admissions made by the Editor of "The [New York] Christian Times," in the same able and candid article that we have just quoted. It will be seen that the writer endorses fully the view that we have maintained throughout this chapter.

"It has been supposed by too many that in the days of Laud the law of the Church of England was made a vast deal more stringent in regard to the maintenance of Episcopacy than before, and that prior to 1662 it was lawful for Presbyterians to officiate and hold livings in the Establishment. *But this was far from being the case;* for *the* LAW *of the Church* was almost substantially *the same both before and after that period,* and what was unlawful at one time must have been unlawful at another. It is true that in the days of Laud men became more stringent in their views of ordination, yet *the law experienced no* material change."—(*Christian Times,* July 20, 1865.)

his own, his argument has been disposed of, "root and branch."

If the reader should desire to investigate more thoroughly the subject of Church practice, we refer him confidently to the general history of the British nation, though written in nearly every case by persons hostile to our cause—Hume and Smollett, Mackintosh, Lingard, Hallam, and Macaulay; but more especially do we commend to his perusal the Ecclesiastical histories already referred to — Collier's, Fuller's, Carwithen's, Short's, Southey's Book of the Church, Soame on the Reformation; the smaller works on the same by Blunt, Wilson, and Bishop Burnet's voluminous and badly arranged, yet valuable history, and the whole works of the honest and pains-taking John Strype. To these may, or rather *ought* to be, added the biographical notices, etc., in the Parker Society Library, and the lives of Cranmer, Jewel, and Laud, by Le Bas (if fuller ones cannot be had); Clarendon's History of the Great Rebellion, Burnet's History of his own Times, Lathbury's History of the Prayer Book, the Convocation, and the Non-Jurors; Birch's Life of Tillotson; Life of Prideaux, etc.; and Neale's Puritans, if its marked unfairness be guarded against: it should always be followed by one or other of the replies to it (say Bishop Maddox's), as well as by Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy.

From these and all other works bearing upon the question at issue the reader will get but one testimony. Whether adversely given or not, it is still the same, namely, that through all changes of fortune the Church has remained faithful to its first

profession, and that, unmoved by the outcries and accusations of its adversaries, it has always acted upon its avowed principles, from the days of Hart, Cole, and Middleton to those of Fox, Naylor, Penn, or Bunyan.*

THE AMERICAN CHURCH, as our readers know, was for more than three generations a part of the English, holding the same doctrines and regimen, and following the same usages in worship. It was one and the same Church on both sides of the Atlantic, though here weak and imperfect, for want of immediate Episcopal supervision and service. The national independence of the United States severed the connection, but produced, of course, no difference in creed or constitution.

We have already seen that Mr. Goode's book acknowledges the substantial identity as still existing, and expressly maintains that the doctrine of both

* This name awakens feelings and is suggestive of thoughts very different from those with which we regard the Penrys and the Bastwicks, or even the Cartwrights and Sampsons, the Owens and Neales, who are all classed under the common title of Puritans or Nonconformists. As truly as it may be said of any man, that he acted under a sense of duty, or with strict regard to the promptings of conscience, we believe it may be said of the glorious dreamer, John Bunyan. We firmly believe not only that he was influenced solely by the hope of doing good, but also that his labors with voice and pen were the means of spiritual profit to many. Still, it does not follow that his work was authorised. It was his duty to have procured a proper commission before undertaking the office of Minister in Christ's Church, and without such commission, however pure in his intentions, he was but an intruder into the sanctuary. If we are asked how we can account for God's giving any blessing upon the ministry of such a person, we reply, the Lord is not bound; He giveth as it hath pleased him. He knows where the intention is good, and also where presumption begins; and we believe, that, for the sake of the pure motive and unconscious offending of many who run before they are sent, He pardons their defect, and accepts their service. Our business, however, is not to devise pleas for irregularity, or speculate upon the length to which one may go with impunity in neglecting or opposing the institutions of God, but carefully to search out His will, and to conform to it under every circumstance.

Churches being the same, whatever, in any disputed point, settles it for one, "settles it for both." We therefore turn to the history of our American Church, and from it we hope to show that the doctrine, as regards Episcopacy and Apostolical Succession, is just the opposite of what he defends.

In the colonial period of our history a memorable event occurred, the results of which are clearly traceable now, after the lapse of a century; we mean the conversion to Episcopacy of the Professors in Yale College, Connecticut. That we may not appear to color the account of this remarkable occurrence, we will give it as it is found in the "Christian Observer" for December, 1832, to which Evangelical magazine, of course, Mr. Goode will not object. After stating that the Rev. Dr. Cutler, Dr. Johnson, etc., etc., who were "Presbyterians or Congregationalists, became unsettled on the subject of Church government, and so set themselves to examine 'honestly and impartially' the best books on both sides of the question," the writer proceeds:

"Accordingly they carefully compared together what was offered by Hoadley and Calamy. They put in the opposite scales Sir Peter King's 'Inquiry' and Slater's 'Original Draught.' They then examined Potter on Church Government, and Mr. Johnson read several of the earliest and best Fathers, in their original languages. The effect was, that from the facts of Scripture, compared with those of the primitive Church, it appeared plain to them that the Episcopal government was universally established by the Apostles wherever they propagated Christianity; that *through the first Order of the Ministry, called* BISHOPS, *the power of the priesthood was to be conveyed from the great* HEAD *of the Church*, and although Presbyters preached and administered the sacraments, yet that *no act of ordination* and government for several ages *was ever allowed to be lawful, without a Bishop* at the head of the Presbytery. All these [things] appeared to them *as evident, from the*

universal testimony of the Church, as the true canon of Scripture itself. It was therefore IMPOSSIBLE for them, after the inquiry, not to suspect, *not only the regularity*, but even the *lawfulness and* VALIDITY of their ordination." Mr. Johnson and six others were summoned before the College Trustees, and were questioned as to their belief. "The declaration of some of them was that *they doubted the validity of Presbyterian Orders*, and of others that *they were fully persuaded of the* INVALIDITY of it." The Memoir goes on to say that Governor Burnett, of New York [son of the Bishop], "assailed Mr. Johnson with Clarke's semi-Arianism and Hoadley's principles respecting ecclesiastical authority." "Mr. JOHNSON read these authors willingly, and admired them as writers, but was shocked with observing their *artifices and subtleties.*" "He was soon able to satisfy himself that Christ and his Apostles did actually establish a certain form and order of government in the Church, which, as to all its essential parts, was to continue to the end of the world; and that it was *not left to the discretion of any human authority to alter or reject it*, as might best suit with worldly convenience."*

Of the seven learned and able men thus won by sheer force of facts and reasoning out of the very camp of the enemy, four went to England for ordination, braving the dangers of a double sea-voyage in those times, rather than be without the "ministry of Apostolical Succession." From these men originated that which is to-day the flourishing diocese of Connecticut.

During the Revolutionary war the Episcopal Clergy were much distressed. Many of them were English by birth, and many who were Americans were unwilling to take a course that would involve, as they believed, violation of their ordination oath. So, clinging to their former allegiance, they voluntarily left the country. Others were driven out, and of those who remained some were so suspected and opposed that they could no longer carry on their work. Consequently the Church was almost extinct. In the great

* This extract is not quoted verbatim, except where it is so marked.

State of New York there were only three, or possibly four, clergymen; in New Jersey about two; and for a considerable time there was only *one* in all Pennsylvania; but he was one for whom we have good reason to thank God—WILLIAM WHITE, *clarum et venerabile nomen!*

In 1782 this eminently good man, deploring the condition of the Church, and seeing no other way of repairing its waste places, proposed, in a pamphlet (which he published without his name), that the Clergy then in the country should take steps for perpetuating the ministry, and otherwise preventing the total destruction of our Zion. We may hold different opinions as to the propriety of recommending ordination by Presbyters, even in such a case, but there can be no doubt whatever of the fact that the circumstances were such as to justify any course that necessity *could* justify, and that if they had not been such Dr. White would never have made the suggestion.

We know few things that illustrate more markedly the demoralizing influence of partyism than the way in which this good man has been misrepresented, on account of the production just mentioned. He has been described as an utter opponent of Scriptural Episcopacy and Apostolical Succession. From the repeated statements to this effect, made in certain journals, the present writer, who had then no better opportunity of knowing the facts, believed that Dr. White thought no more of Episcopacy than Bishop Hoadley did, and the surprise which a first glance at his own works produced will not soon be forgotten.

It has always, of course, been regarded as a matter of prime importance to be in harmony with the

FATHER of the American Church, and thence this most unjust representation of his opinions. His pamphlet (which never served any purpose, inasmuch as the providence of God soon put an end to the difficulty, which seemed insurmountable when it was written) has been reprinted in Philadelphia, after an interval of seventy-seven years, for the purpose of aiding a party, and under pretence of setting forth his true views on the subject of Church government. Thus, that which was produced under circumstances of peculiar exigency has been treated as if it were written in the ordinary state of the Church, or as if, from what he proposed in such an emergency, we could justly infer what he would defend or permit in a more favorable time.

If he had never written anything else upon the subject we confess that, with proper guards and acknowledgments, this pamphlet might be referred to; but, inasmuch as he did write formal lectures and dissertations upon it, we should suppose that persons who really wished to ascertain his views would study *them;* or that parties honestly desiring to propagate the opinions of the venerable author, would not, while those writings are accessible, resort to this exceptional pamphlet, and give to it the title of "Bishop White on Episcopacy." But this is not our present business.

The suggestion of Dr. White was that the American Clergy should express publicly

"A general approbation of Episcopacy, and a declaration of intention *to procure the Succession as soon as conveniently may be,* but in the mean time to carry the plan into effect without waiting for the Succession."

Even here, then, we see a tender regard for that

which Mr. Goode and persons of his school regard so little.

But how was the proposal met by the Church? His own "Memoirs" will inform us.

"The author found himself in danger of being involved in a dispute with the Clergy of Connecticut, in the name of whom, assembled in Convention, the Rev. Abraham Jarvis addressed a letter, complaining of the performance, although doubtless *mistaking the object of it.* This letter was answered, it is hoped, in a friendly manner, and there the matter ended. The same Convention, in the address sent by them to the Archbishop of York, alluded to the pamphlet as evidence of a design to set up *an Episcopacy on the ground of Presbyterial and lay authority.* No personal animosity became the result of this *misapprehension,* and other matters have manifested consent in all matters essential to ecclesiastical discipline."—(Pp. 89, 90.)

And then, as if to condemn by anticipation the course of those who have claimed to be his only true followers, the venerable author goes on to say:

"On the communication from Connecticut it will not be offensive, at the present day, to make the following remarks. There pervades it the defect of not distinguishing between the state of public concerns then and as they stood when the pamphlet [appeared]. Nearly a year,* and the acknowledgment of independence, had intervened."—(P. 91.)

"It is difficult, in avoiding one extreme, not to fall under the appearance of its opposite. Many years after the publication of the pamphlet, a clergyman of standing in an Anti-Episcopalian society alleged some passages of the performance as *sustaining ordination not Episcopal,* but he had the candor publicly *acknowledge his* MISTAKE when it was *pointed out to him.*"—(P. 92.)

We have dwelt on this so far for two reasons: (1st) Because the opinions of Bishop White are of special consequence. (2nd) They would naturally control his conduct, and *his* acts would be considered (in a

* He thus protested against its being judged after an interval of *one* year. What would he have said if he had known that it would be reprinted, as a sort of "campaign document," more than *fifty* years later?

greater degree than those of any other man) the acts of the Church. (3rd) It is the only matter in our history that has even the appearance of favoring Mr. Goode's theory. To this statement one exception may be made, viz., that the Southern Churchmen seemed inclined to surrender Episcopacy;* at all events, they were so indifferent that, though they had chosen Dr. Griffith to be their Bishop, they would not bear the charges of his voyage to Europe for consecration, and he being too poor to make the journey at his own expense, they remained without a Bishop. This comparative indifference is acknowledged, but unhappily it did not stand alone. Associated with it were laxity of morals, absence of true Church life, and willingness to abandon fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. Those who would have preferred a Prayer Book with the doctrine of the TRINITY left out, might be expected to get, in other respects, as far as possible from the Christian Church of all ages.

But to return. The difficulty having been in a very great measure removed, by the acknowledgment of American independence, Dr. White and other clergymen engaged at once in the attempt to put their beloved Church in a better position.

"The first step towards the forming of a collective body of the Episcopal Church in the United States was taken at a meeting, for another purpose, of a few clergymen of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, at Brunswick, in New Jersey, on the 13th and 14th of May, 1784."

In the same month a meeting was held in Philadelphia, where, under the influence of Dr. White,

* Bishop White's Memoirs, p. 79.

resolutions were passed, which were also adopted at a meeting of the Clergy of Massachusetts, held at Boston, in the following September. Of these resolutions, the third declares the intention to preserve uniformity to the doctrine and worship of the Church of England, as far as possible. The fourth reads thus:

"That the SUCCESSION of the Ministry be agreeable to the usage which requireth the THREE ORDERS of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; that the rights and powers of the same be respectively ascertained; and that they be exercised according to reasonable laws, to be duly made."

Even previous to these resolutions others no less decided were passed in Maryland, at the Conventions of August, 1783, and June, 1784, chiefly under the influence of the eminent Rev. Dr. Smith, Provost of Pennsylvania University. Of these the second was:

"That ever since the Reformation it hath been the received doctrine of the Church of which we are members * * * * that there be THREE ORDERS of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and *that an* EPISCOPAL ORDINATION *and commission are* NECESSARY *to the valid administration of the Sacraments* and to the due exercise of the ministerial function in the said Church."*—(*Bishop White's Memoirs*, p. 93.)

* This resolution being the work of Dr. Smith, it may surprise the reader to hear that he also is claimed as an opponent of Succession, because, in a sermon before the first General Convention, he said:

"It will not be so much a question at the last day, of what Church we were; not whether we were of Paul or Apollos, but whether we were of Christ Jesus, and had the true marks of Christianity in our lives."

This is certainly *strong* proof that the preacher did not hold to the doctrine of Succession!

In the Convention which passed Dr. Smith's resolutions a prominent member was Dr. Claggett, afterwards Bishop of the diocese. If the reader will bear this in mind he will be better able to appreciate the force and fairness of the following argument. A Reverend gentleman, to whose pamphlets we have referred more than once, proposes the question whether the use of the term "Ministers of Apostolic Succession," in our Institution service, does not involve the doctrine? He says it does not. "There is not the *slightest allusion* to a ministerial tactual Succession!" Such is his decision, and *this* is the reason for it:

"The Prayer itself was introduced into the Liturgy and recommended

These three Diocesan Conventions, then, declared point-blank their unshaken attachment to principles which our author regards as "monstrous," and which he endeavors to show were never held by the Episcopal Church.

The Northern and Eastern provinces were more forward still. The Churchmen there were not willing to put up any longer with an imperfect ministry. They knew that what God had ordained in his Church was necessary for its life and growth, and so they resolved to procure a Bishop. The proclamation of peace opened the door for the accomplishment of their wishes; and so, even before the British soldiery had left our shores, the Clergy of Connecticut selected the Rev. Dr. Leaming to be their Episcopal head. His age and infirmities prevented his accepting the office, and then their attention was turned to the Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury, who was duly elected on the 21st of April, 1783.

Dr. Seabury went immediately to England, with his credentials and an earnest entreaty from the Clergy of Connecticut, that their Bishop-elect might receive canonical consecration. From the petition they forwarded we extract a single sentence:

"To lay the foundation for a VALID and REGULAR Episcopate in America, we earnestly entreat your Grace that, in your Archiepiscopal character, you will espouse the cause of our sinking Church, and at this important crisis afford her that

---

for use when Bishops WHITE, CLAGGETT, and MOORE formed the majority of our House of Bishops, the same divines who signed the comprehensive catholic address to General Washington, already given. *No prayer of an exclusive ecclesiastical character would have been permitted to be introduced into our services at that day.* Bishop White's influence was paramount in the Convention!"—(*Gallagher on True Apostolical Succession*, p. 28.)

relief upon which her very existence depends, by consecrating a Bishop for Connecticut."

But, however much the English Prelates might, as individuals, desire to grant the request of the American Church, they had not the power. Their actions were defined and limited by law. They had no authority to proceed in such a case, no right to consecrate any one without the royal order or permission, and no right to use any other consecration service than that in which the oath of allegiance to the British monarch was included. If they were to grant the prayer of the Connecticut Clergy it would be necessary to get a special Act of Parliament, or at least the royal mandate, and neither could be readily procured just then, when the ministers were suffering the disappointment and pain of defeat. Nearly a whole year was spent in negotiation, and, as nothing could be done, Dr. Seabury applied to the then weak and persecuted Church of Scotland, which, to quote the language of Bishop A. C. Coxe,

"Had not only preserved the Apostolical Succession, it had maintained the faith in its purity; and, having been deprived of all its temporalities, was entirely free from the State, and able to act for itself."*

After mature deliberation, it was determined to grant the request, and on the 14th day of November, A. D. 1784, Dr. Samuel Seabury was duly ordained or consecrated Bishop, in the ancient city of Aberdeen, by the Right Rev. Bishop Kilgour, Primus; Bishop Petrie, of Ross and Moray; and Bishop John Skinner, coadjutor to the Primus.

* Sermon on Bishop Seabury, quoted in Norton's Life.

The sermon was preached by Bishop Skinner (favorably known to us as the author of the work in defence of "Primitive Truth and Order"), who, as Rev. Mr. Norton says, in his sketch of Seabury's life,

"Clearly and unanswerably explained the origin and nature of the authority *by which* ALONE the ministers of Christ are empowered to act in His behalf."

The general character of the sermon may be learned from the following extract, given by the same writer:

"As long as there are nations to be instructed in the principles of the Gospel, or a Church to be formed in any part of the inhabited world, the SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES are obliged, by the commission which they hold, to contribute as far as they can, or may be required of them, to the propagation of these principles, and to the formation of every Church upon the most pure and primitive model. No fear of worldly censure ought to keep them back from so good a work; no connection with any state nor dependence on any government whatever should tie up their hands from communicating the blessings of that kingdom which is not of this world, and diffusing the means of salvation by a VALID *and* REGULAR *ministry*, wherever they may be wanted."

This is sufficient to show the idea of the Church and ministry entertained by those who gave (and also as we know by him who then received) the Episcopal authority.

Bishop Seabury returned to America in the following summer, landing at Newport, Rhode Island, on the 20th of June, 1785.

"On the 27th of September," says Bishop White, in his Memoirs, "there assembled, agreeably to appointment, in Philadelphia, a Convention of clerical and lay deputies from seven of the thirteen United States." "The Convention entered on the business of the Episcopacy with the knowledge that there was now a Bishop in Connecticut, consecrated not in England, but by the Nonjuring Bishops of Scotland; for Dr. Seabury,

not meeting assurance of success with the Bishops of the former country, had applied to the latter quarter for *the* SUCCESSION *which had there been carefully maintained*, notwithstanding their severance from the State in the revolution of 1688. Bishop Seabury had returned to America, and had entered on the exercise of his new functions in the beginning of the preceding summer, and two or three gentlemen of the Southern States had received ordination from him. Nevertheless, the members of the Convention, although generally impressed with sentiments of respect towards the new Bishop, and although, with the exception of a few, alleging nothing against the validity of his Episcopacy, thought it most proper to direct their views in the first instance towards England."

Offers of a very friendly character were made by the Danish authorities, but for the same reason they were declined. Dr. White and Dr. Provoost went, as Seabury had done before them, to the heads of the English Church. But they were not immediately successful. Although the way was cleared considerably by changes that had taken place in the interim, there were still some difficulties to be overcome. At last, however, on the 4th of February, 1787,

"In the chapel of the Archiepiscopal palace of Lambeth, Dr. White and Dr. Provoost were ordained and consecrated Bishops by the Most Rev. John Moore, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Most Rev. William Markham, Archbishop of York presented, and the Bishops who joined with the two Archbishops in the imposition of hands were the Right Rev. Charles Moss, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and the Right Rev. John Hinchcliff, Bishop of Peterborough."

"Before the end of the same month the newly consecrated Bishops sailed from Falmouth for New York, where they arrived on Easter Sunday, April 7th, and soon after began the exercise of the Episcopacy in their respective dioceses." — (*Memoirs*, p. 28.)

And now we ask the reader to consider how all this can be reconciled to the theory of Mr. Goode. In such great scarcity of clergymen, why should the life of any one of the little band have been risked in

the double sea-voyage?* Why should the Clergy in America have stooped to make such requests to the English authorities? Why should their chosen candidates have been required to wait the tardy law's delay, if that which was sought were really no more than a matter of human appointment? If the Presbyter and Bishop were essentially of the same Order, all the authority or jurisdiction might have been given *here*, without expense or risk or humiliating applications and delays. Why then did the whole American Church, as represented by the Connecticut and the Philadelphia Convention, judge that, at all sacrifices, the Church should procure a properly consecrated Order of Bishops? Was it not because they held views diametrically opposite to those of Mr. Goode? They did *not* think the doctrine of Apostolical Succession "monstrous." They did *not* regard the Episcopate and Presbyterate as one Order. They did *not* recognize the validity or lawfulness of Presbyterian ordination.

But it is capable of proof that the opinions of those English Prelates who transmitted the Succession did not differ from those of the Church to which the gift was imparted. If the Archbishop, etc., had looked upon the Episcopate merely as an office or dignity (as distinguished from a sacred Order), having once done what was required of them, they would have given themselves no further concern. But this was not the case. The constant law of the Church had

* Of those who went to England for Orders in those days, one in five perished. Messrs. Giles and Wilson, on their return voyage, were shipwrecked and lost near the mouth of the Delaware. Such was the too frequent result of Atlantic voyages in those times. Deaths also occurred from disease, as in the case of Mr. Brown, one of Johnson's colleagues.

required that three Bishops should take part in every consecration; not that *one* could not give a valid authority, as well as ten, but that there should always be enough to secure a full and unquestionable commission. Here then were only two ordained by them as Bishops for America, and if they by themselves should consecrate others, or even if they should, for that purpose, unite with any others, the validity of whose Orders might be doubted, an *irregular* or *questionable* Episcopate would be the result; and so they required a sort of pledge that Bishops White and Provoost would not proceed to any consecration without first obtaining the requisite number.*

To those who regard the Bishop as simply a Presiding Elder, or who look upon the Apostolical Succession as a "figment," all this must appear no more than solemn trifling. Consequently, the grave and reverend divines who were so scrupulous had no such opinions.

But to return to America.

"On the 28th of July, 1789, there assembled the Triennial Convention, by whom the Episcopacy of Bishops White and Provoost * * * was duly recognized. At this Convention there naturally occurred the importance of taking *measures for the perpetuating of the* SUCCESSION, which some circumstances had subjected to considerable difficulty."—(*Memoir*, p. 29.)

The good Bishop then goes on to say, that the Clergy of Massachusetts had nominated Dr. Bass, and requested Bishop Seabury, Bishop Provoost, and himself to unite in consecrating him; but, although perfectly willing on other grounds, he considered such an act would be a violation of "the faith impliedly

* Bishop White's Memoir, p. 29.

pledged." Yet, to show his desire for such a union with the Bishop and Church of Connecticut, he expressed his belief of the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration, and the Convention passed a vote to that effect. But why all this care, or why did Bishop Provoost deny the validity of that consecration, if the whole matter were one of mere form and dignity? The very objection to the genuineness of Bishop Seabury's Episcopal commission could have no other foundation than a belief in the necessity of Apostolical Succession.

The consecration in England of Dr. Madison as Bishop of Virginia removed the difficulty about uniting with Bishop Seabury in such services, and so, when the Rev. Thomas J. Claggett, D.D., came to be consecrated Bishop of Maryland, Bishop Provoost presided, and Bishops Seabury, White and Madison united with him in the laying on of hands. A writer in the "Churchman's Magazine," quoted by Rev. Mr. Norton says:

> Bishop Claggett "used to speak with much satisfaction of the union in his consecration of the direct ancient line of the APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION with that which, more than a century before, had been derived from that line for Scotland, and thence descended in the Scotch line."*

From that time to this the succession has been carefully maintained in the American Church.† There

* This is the Bishop Claggett who (according to Mr. Gallagher) would not have sanctioned the use of the words "Apostolical Succession" in the Prayer Book, if they were to be understood as meaning Apostolical Succession!

† It has been regarded as a matter both of interest and value that the English Succession was once more conveyed to this Church by the Right Rev. Dr. Fulford, Bishop of Montreal and Metropolitan of Canada, who participated in the consecration of the late Bishop Wainwright, of New York, and again in that of Bishop Quintard, of Tennessee, October, 1865.

has been no violation of the venerable canons, and no acknowledgment of any person as Bishop, Priest, or Deacon who had not been previously ordained as such by proper Episcopal authority. Consequently, the history and present practice of the American Church are, like those of its English parent, in unison with the principles we defend, and irreconcilably opposed to those of Mr. Goode.

CHAPTER X.

SECONDARY STANDARDS.

AMONG those works which possess a value or authority greater than the unsanctioned writings of individual men, and almost as great as the formularies or official documents, we might class all the works of Cranmer; but we prefer reserving for the next chapter what still remains to be furnished from his pen.

The various publications which can be classed as secondary standards, having been set forth by the highest authority or adopted by Convocation, as expressing the Church's doctrine, are the Homilies, the Catechisms of Poynet and Nowell, Erasmus's Paraphrase on the New Testament, Jewel's Apology, and (though in a less degree) Bullinger's Decades.

These works were written at a time when the rights of the Episcopal Order were not called in question in England. The Homilies were for a plain, unlettered people, who had never known any other than an Episcopal ministry, and among whom there was no question upon the matter. The same remark applies to the Catechisms, while Jewel's Apology was simply the Anglican Church's justification of her separation from the Roman communion; and, as we

have no difference with Rome as to the party possessing the right to ordain, nor as to the necessity for a transmitted authority, full and special reference to those matters would not be made in that work.

Still something bearing upon our general subject may be found in it and the others.

THE HOMILIES.—In these it is evidently taken for granted that the true constitution of the Church of Christ is precisely what the Preface to the Ordinal declares, and what we maintain it to be. So the office of Bishop is always referred to as lawful and Scriptural, and the pretensions of the Roman Prelate (or Pope) are treated not as a usurpation over the rights of *Presbyters*, but of Bishops.

"The office of Bishops and Pastors is to praise good men for well doing, that they may continue therein; and to rebuke and correct by the word of God the offences and crimes of all evil-disposed persons.—(*On Charity*; Amer. ed., Baltimore, 1823.)

"And as they have most earnestly written, so did they most sincerely and most diligently, in their time, teach and preach according to their writings and examples, for they were then preaching Bishops, and more often seen in pulpits than in princes' palaces; more occupied in His legacy who said, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to all men,' than in embassages and affairs of princes of this world.—(*Against Peril of Idolatry.*)

"We may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the Bishops of Rome and their adherents are not the true Church of Christ, much less then to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same."

"They will be termed universal Bishops and Heads of all Christian Churches through the world."—(*For Whit-Sunday.*)

"The Holy Scriptures do teach most expressly that our Saviour Christ himself, and his Apostles St. Paul and St. Peter, with others, were unto the magistrates and higher powers which ruled at their being upon earth, both obedient themselves, and did also diligently and earnestly exhort all other Christians to the like obedience unto their princes and governors, whereby it is evident that men of the Clergy and ecclesiastical ministers, as *their* SUCCESSORS, ought themselves specially and before others to be obedient unto their princes," etc., etc.

"The Bishop of Rome being by *the order of* GOD'S WORD *none other than the* BISHOP *of that one See and Diocese*, and never yet able to govern the same, did by intolerable ambition challenge not only to be the head of all the Church dispersed throughout the world, but also to be lord of all kingdoms of the world," etc., etc.—(*Against Wilful Rebellion.*)

POYNET.—The definition of the Church of Christ given in the Catechism of Edward VI. is not much to the point, but yet may be fairly regarded as implying nearly all that we contend for.

"That congregation is nothing elsse but a certayne multytude of menne which, wheresoever they be, professe the pure and uprighte learning of Christ, and that in such sort as it is faithfully set fourth in the Holy Testament by the Evangelists and Apostles; whiche *in all points are governed and ruled by the laws and statutes of theyr King and hye Byshoppe*, Christe, in the bonde of charity; which use his holy mysteryes, that are commonlie called Sacramentes, with such purenesse and simplicity (as touchynge theire nature and substance) as the Apostles of Christ used and left behind in writing. The marckes therefore of this Churche are: firste, pure preachyng of the Gospel; then brotherly love, out of which, as members out of al one body, springeth good wyl of eche to other; thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lorde's Sacraments according to the ordynaunce of the Gospell; laste of all, brotherlye correction and excommunication, or banishynge those out of the Church which wyl not amend their lives. This marcke the holye fathers termed discipline. This is that same Churche that is grounded upon the assured rocke Jesus Christ and upon trust in him. This is that same Church which St. Paul calleth the piller and upholding stay of truth. To this Church belong the keies whearwyth heaven is locked and unlocked; for that is done by the ministration of the worde; whereunto properly appertayneth the power to bind and loose, to holde for gylty and to forgive synnes. So that whosoever believeth the Gospell preached in this Church he shall be saved, but whoso believeth not the same shall be damned."—(*Randolph's Enchiridion*, Vol. i., p. 26.)

NOWELL.—To the same effect is that given in Nowell's Catechism. After mentioning as among the notes of the Church, "prædicationem, invocationem et Sacramentorum administrationem synce-

ram," all of which require, of course, a regular ministry, he proceeds:

"Sunt hæ quidem Ecclesiæ visibilis notæ præcipuæ et plane necessariæ; ut sine quibus ne Ecclesia quidem Christi esse, dicive recte possit. Sed et in eadem Ecclesia *si probe instituta fuerit certus gubernationis ordo et modus*," etc., etc.

The rite of Confirmation is thus spoken of:

"Episcopus enim rationem Religionis a pueris exquirebat; pueri Fidei suæ rationem Episcopo reddebant; quos vero in religionis scientia progressus jam satis magnos fecisse Episcopus putabat eos approbabat, et imposita illis manu bene precatus dimittebat. Hanc Episcopi approbationem benedictionemque, nostri Confirmationem apellant."

Let it be borne in mind, as already stated, that the Order of Bishops was acknowledged as of divine institution by all in England when this was written, and it strongly corroborates our position.

ERASMUS.—In the Injunctions issued on the accession of Edward VI. (A. D. 1547), it was ordered, that

"Every parson, vicar, curate, chantry priest, and stipendiary, being under the degree of Bachelor of Divinity, shall provide and have of his own, within three months after this visitation, the New Testament, both in Latin and in English, with PARAPHRASIS upon the same of ERASMUS, and diligently studying the same, conferring one with the other."

In the Visitation articles of inquiry set forth in the same year, by Archbishop Cranmer, it is asked

"Whether in every cure they have provided one book of the whole Bible of the largest volume in English, and the Paraphrasis of Erasmus, also in English, upon the Gospels [all that was then translated], and set up the same in some convenient place in the Church, where their parishioners may most commodiously resort to the same."

Another inquiry was, whether the Clergy had possessed themselves of the Bible and of the said Paraphrase, as ordered in the Injunctions. Questions and orders to the same effect were issued at different times

thereafter, as, for instance, in the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, in 1559; by the second Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury (Parker), in 1569; again by Archbishop Grindal, in 1576; and again by Archbishop Bancroft, in 1610. These orders to procure and study Erasmus's Paraphrase were so long kept up, or so often repeated, that that work may be safely said to have received stronger commendation from the authorities of the Church than any uninspired composition, save the Liturgy, Articles, and Homilies. At the very least, it stands on the highest level next to them, or among the secondary standards, and probably did more to form the opinions of the divines of that age than any other book. How then does its teaching affect the question before us? We need only reply, that it describes the office of Timothy and Titus as that of Bishop and Archbishop, and gives to every text in connection with the authority committed to those Apostolic men the very rendering that is always insisted on by Episcopalians. So decidedly of this character is it, that even Gardiner, the Romish Bishop of Winchester, protested against it on that account, as well as others. His objections to advocacy of the Episcopacy could only lie against making it *jure divino*, and not derived through the Pope; so, when he did object, we may know that Erasmus took the very ground so distasteful to the followers of the Pope and of Mr. Goode. Gardiner says:

"Whatsoever might be spoke to defame princes' government is not left unspoken. BISHOPS *be more gentle handled.* Erasmus maketh them *very* KINGS OF THE GOSPEL, and calleth the true kings of the world profane kings."—(*Strype's Cranmer*, 12mo. edit., London; Vol. ii., p. 325.)

Such, then, is the light in which the Episcopate was represented in a work that was for so long the authorized exposition of the Gospel Scriptures, "delivering," as Bancroft said, "plainly to every man's understanding the true sense and meaning of the whole New Testament." Here, then, we have, for three-fourths of the century which Mr. Goode claims, a series of official endorsements of a work teaching doctrines the very opposite of those put forth in this "Essay" before us.

JEWEL.—The Apology for the Church of England, from the pen of Bishop Jewel, was one of the most valuable works ever issued by an Episcopal divine. But it has an importance beyond what its intrinsic excellence would give. It had the express sanction of Convocation; it was adopted as the Church's work, and, with the Defence of it against Harding, was put up in the churches for public perusal.* The whole works of this eminent Prelate were also commended in the injunctions of Archbishop Bancroft, A. D. 1610.†

We refer to the Apology, then, to see what it contains bearing upon our topic. Let it be borne in mind that the English Reformers considered it "evident, from Holy Scripture and ancient authors," that there had always been in Christ's Church those three Orders, "Bishops, Priests, and Deacons;" and further, that at the time the Apology appeared this threefold ministry was not impugned in England, nor, of course,

* So important was the Apology considered, that Archbishop Parker wrote a public letter of thanks to Lady Bacon for her translation of it into English, by which she had "deserved well of the Church of Christ."

† See Cardwell's "Synodalia," Vol. ii., p. 160.

questioned at all by the Romanists, against whom the work was written.

In answer to the cry

"That we are all heretics, and have forsaken the faith, and have with new persuasions and wicked learning utterly dissolved the concord of the Church," he says:

"If we do show it plain, that *God's holy Gospel, the ancient Bishops, and the primitive Church do make on our side*, and that we have not without just cause left these men, and rather have returned to the Apostles and old catholic fathers," etc., etc.—(P. 56, Parker Soc. ed.)

"We believe that there is one Church of God, and that the same is not shut up (as in times past among the Jews) into some corner or kingdom, but that it is catholic and universal," etc., etc.

"Furthermore, that there be *divers degrees of Ministers in the Church*, whereof some be DEACONS, some PRIESTS, some BISHOPS; to whom is committed the office to instruct the people, and the whole charge and setting forth of religion."—(P. 59.)

"Furthermore, we say that the minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the Church of God, and that no man hath power to wrest himself into the holy ministry at his own pleasure and list. Wherefore these persons do us the greater wrong which which have nothing so common in their mouths as that we do nothing orderly or comely, but all things troublesomely and without order; and that we allow every man to be a priest, to be a teacher, and to be an interpreter of the Scriptures."—(P. 60.)

"Indeed, we grant that certain new and very strange sects, as the Anabaptists, Libertines, Menonians, Zwenckfeldians, have been stirring in the world ever since the Gospel did first spring. But the world seeth now right well (thanks be given to our God) that we neither have bred nor taught nor kept up these monsters."—(P. 67.)

Appended to Lady Bacon's translation is an account of the Church and Universities, as then (and in a great measure still) governed. It says:

"Among us here in England no man is called or preferred to be a Bishop, except he have first received the *Orders of priesthood* and be well able to instruct the people in the Holy Scriptures."

These extracts furnish satisfactory testimony to

the constitution of the Church as it really existed, and to the light in which it was regarded by the chief divines of that day.

BULLINGER. — As this eminent theologian belonged to a Church in which ministers were set apart by laying on of the hands of Presbyters, it could not be expected that in any of his writings he would directly condemn that custom. We are not surprised, therefore, to find him arguing, in one part of the fifth Decade against the *exclusive* right of the Bishop to ordain. But the reader may not be prepared to find him furnishing such decisive testimony against the doctrine of Presbyterian parity as this:

"Now by all these things we think it is manifest to all men what Orders the Lord himself hath ordained from the beginning, and whom he hath consecrated to the holy ministry of the Church and to govern his own Church. He laid the foundation of the Church at the beginning by Apostles, Evangelists, and Prophets. He enlarged and maintained the same by Pastors and Doctors. To these Elders and Deacons were helpers."

"For many ages since and immediately after the foundation of Christ's kingdom on earth, the Apostles, Evangelists, and Prophets ceased, and there came in their place Bishops, Pastors, Doctors, and Elders, which order *hath continued most steadfastly* in the Church; that now we cannot doubt that the order of the Church is *perfect and absolute*, if at this day also there remain in the Church of God Bishops or Pastors, Doctors also or Elders."—(Vol. v., pp. 108, 109.)

Bullinger's use of the word "ordain" in the place mentioned above is ambiguous. It was understood as meaning to *choose*, or *appoint*, for he speaks of ordaining "by lot," which of course was *electing*. But the English authorities did not wish even this lesser right to be denied to Bishops, so the editor added a note, in which he quotes Bullinger against himself.

CHAPTER XI.

OPINIONS OF DIVINES.

BEFORE furnishing our catena of authorities in support of the principles herein maintained, we would remind the reader of what has been said on this subject in Chapter V. The opinions of divines are valuable indeed, but they are not the VOX ECCLESIÆ. At best they are but echoes of that voice, or in harmony with it. If they give a different, or even an uncertain, sound, they go for nothing.

The mere fact that many prominent clergymen have held such or such views does not go one step towards proving that THE CHURCH holds them. The most it can do is to create *a presumption* in favor of their being Church doctrine, which reference to the proper sources of information will either confirm or destroy. Opinions, having thus no positive value in such a discussion as the present, we attach no especial importance to them. Consequently we look upon this part of our work as the least satisfactory, though it is the one upon which Mr. Goode lays greatest stress. We claim for what is to follow no more than the weight that is due to *indirect corroborative evidence*, but as such we confidently submit it to the consider-

ation of the reader. Having fully and carefully examined the standards and, as we believe, ascertained their teaching, we are at liberty to furnish testimony from eminent Bishops and other clergymen in the successive periods of the Church's history, in support of the interpretation we have given to the authentic documents; and in doing this we shall take care to give, as far as we have been able to ascertain them, the *mature* or *real* opinions of the men whose works we quote.

ARCHBISHOP CRANMER naturally heads the list. If a Romanist were to print the "Recantation" of this great and good man as the true expression of his opinion upon the character and authority of the Church of Rome, we presume Mr. Goode would very indignantly denounce such a proceeding as manifestly unfair or dishonorable. But it would not be one jot less fair than printing the "Replies" of 1540 as his real or only views upon the Christian ministry. This has been done by several prominent Anti-Episcopal controversialists, much to their discredit; but there was this measure of excuse for them—they could not be expected to have much knowledge of Cranmer and his works, beyond what is supplied in the general histories of the country. An Episcopal minister should have a much better acquaintance with the real character and the writings of the Father of the Reformed Church of England; but some, we regret to say, repeat the misrepresentations of their Presbyterian or Methodist predecessors, and thus leave themselves open to the suspicion of being ignorant of Cranmer's judgment upon so grave a matter, or else of suppressing the truth. We shall not attempt

to decide upon which horn of the dilemma our author would prefer being impaled.

In a former chapter we have shown that previous to 1540 the Archbishop held views totally different from those expressed in the memorable paper of that year, and we have stated that subsequently to it he openly avowed opinions equally irreconcilable with those in that unfortunate document. Does Mr. Goode know this? If he does, why does he conceal it? If not, why does he not read the very works from which he quotes? Will he explain to his readers his silence upon the well-known fact, that, *on the very sheet from which those answers were reprinted, Cranmer, at some subsequent time, indicated a complete change of mind*, by affixing his signature to the responses of Dr. Leighton. Mr. Good copies the "Answers" from Collier and Burnet. Either of these would have informed him of the Archbishop's return to his senses, or rather to his liberty. Burnet says, that in 1548

"Cranmer" "had now quite laid aside those *singular* opinions which he formerly held of the ecclesiastical functions; for now, in a work which was wholly his own, without the concurrence of any others, *he fully set forth their divine institution!*"—(*Hist. Reformation*, Vol. i., p. 341, Bohn's edit.)

But of this circumstance Mr. Goode's readers are not informed.

The work to which Burnet refers is the "Catechism" commonly called Cranmer's, though originally written in German, by one of the Reformers (probably Osiander, Cranmer's father-in-law), translated into Latin by Justus Jonas, and into English either by Cranmer himself or under his supervision. Burnet thinks it *exclusively* his own, but it was not so. It was his by full adoption, and, doubtless, also

by change and addition, and the sentiments expressed in the body of the work harmonize thoroughly with those in the dedicatory letter to the King, which was from his own hand. It is supposed, on good grounds, that the "Sermon on the Keys," included in the Catechism, is the Archbishop's own composition. It is plainly attributed to him in the copy now before us, which is a black-letter fac simile, printed at London, in 1708.* From this remarkable sermon we print a few paragraphs, which the reader will hardly believe could be written by the same Cranmer of whom our author speaks.

The text is Romans x. 14, 15, and the preacher says it declares "two lessons:"

"The first is, that it is necessary to our salvation to have preachers and ministers of God's most holy word to instruct us in the true faith and knowledge of God.

"The second is, that preachers must not run to this high honor before they be called thereto, but they must be ordained and appointed to this office, and sent to us by God," etc., etc.

"Again, the teachers, except they be called and sent, cannot fruitfully teach. For the seed of God's word doth never bring forth fruit unless the Lord of the harvest do give increase, and by His Holy Spirit do work with the sower. But God doth not work with the preacher whom He hath not sent; as St. Paul saith, 'How shall they preach, if they be not sent?' Wherefore it is requisite that preachers should be called and sent of God; and they must preach according to the authority and commission of God granted unto them, whereby they may strengthen men's belief, and assure their consciences that God hath commanded them to preach after this or that manner."

---

* "Taken from A Sermon of the Authoritie of the Kayes, fol. CCXXVI. of the book entituled 'CATECHISMUS, that is to say, a short instruction into Christian Religion, etc., by the Most Rev'd Father in God Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitane. *Gualterus Lynne, excudebat* 1548.'"

The spelling has been modernized. In the original it was thus:

"So ye haue, good children, the begynnynge and foundation of the ministers of God's worde, and of the Authoritye of the Kayes as our lord Jesus Christ did first ordeyne and institute the same."

"Our Lord Jesus Christ hath both ordained and appointed ministers and preachers to teach us His holy word and to minister his Sacraments, and also hath appointed them what they shall teach in His name," etc., etc. "Therefore he called them and sent them, and gave them instructions what they should do and speak to us in His name, to the intent that we should give sure credence unto their words, and believe that God will work with us according to His words by them spoken. And He hath promised, therefore, that whatsoever they shall bind upon earth should be bound in heaven, and whatsoever they should loose upon earth should be loosed in heaven also."

Having thus shown the divine institution and authority of the Christian Ministry, the Archbishop proceeds to speak of the Apostles' having laid their hands upon persons "who were godly and mete to preach God's word."

"And they that were so ordained were in deed, and also were called the ministers of God, as the Apostles themselves were, as Paul saith unto Timothy. *And so the ministration of God's word was* DERIVED FROM THE APOSTLES *unto others after them by imposition of hands and giving the Holy Ghost, from the Apostles' time to our days.* And this was the Consecration, Orders, and unction of the Apostles, whereby they at the beginning made BISHOPS AND PRIESTS, and *this shall continue in the Church even to the world's end.* And whatsoever rite or ceremony hath been added more than this cometh of man's ordinance and policy, and is *not commanded by God's word.*"

"Wherefore, good children, you shall steadfastly believe all those things which such ministers shall speak unto you from the mouth and by the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ. And whatsoever they do to you, as when they baptize you, when they give you absolution, and distribute to you the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, these you shall so esteem as if Christ himself in his own person did speak and minister unto you. For Christ hath commanded His ministers to do this unto you, and He himself (although you see him not with your bodily eyes) is present with His ministers and worketh by the Holy Ghost in the administration of his Sacraments."

"And on the other side, you shall take good heed and *beware of false and privy preachers which privily creep into cities and preach in corners,* HAVING NONE AUTHORITY, *nor being called to this office.* For Christ is not present with such preachers, and therefore the Holy Ghost doth not work by their preaching, but

their word is without fruit or profit, and they do great hurt in commonwealths."

Such, then, were the real opinions of Cranmer upon the constitution of the sacred Ministry and Apostolical Succession.

BISHOP RIDLEY.—This learned Prelate was the friend and associate of Cranmer, and a fellow-sufferer with him for the truth of Christ. He has not left behind him any very express statement of his views on the subjects under consideration, but, as he was one of the principal authors of our first standards, as his administration of his diocese was in strict accordance with the doctrine of the 36th Article and the Ordinal, and as he did not write a sentence opposed to the principles we maintain, we are entitled to presume that he held them. His opinion of the Church is as follows:

"The holy Catholic Church, which is the communion of Saints, the house of God, the city of God, the spouse of Christ, the body of Christ, the pillar and stay of the truth: this Church I believe according to the Creed; this Church I do reverence and honor in the Lord. But the rule of this Church is the word of God, according to which rule we go forward unto life. And as many as walk according to this rule I say, with St. Paul, 'Peace be upon them and upon Israel which pertaineth unto God.'"

The marks of this Church he enumerates thus:

"The sincere preaching of God's word; *the due administration of the Sacraments;* charity; and *faithful observing of ecclesiastical discipline according to the word of God.*"

"And that Church or congregation which is garnered with these marks is in very deed that heavenly Jerusalem, which consisteth of those that be born from above. This is the mother of us all, and by God's grace I will live and die the child of this Church. Forth of this, I grant, there is no salvation."

To the objection that this Church is "invisible," Ridley replies:

"The Church which I have described is visible. It hath members which may be seen, and also I have before declared by what marks and tokens it may be known."

In answer to the next objection of "the Antonian," he says:

"That the name of the Church is taken after three divers manners in the Scripture."

These he goes on to explain. The first is the whole body of professing Christians; the second, the faithful within that body, "*which hath the same outward society of the Sacraments and ministry of the word;*" the third, the unfaithful, who are therefore rather the synagogue or church of Satan.

At his Disputation at Oxford, just before his martyrdom, when charged with the authorship of a certain Catechism said to have been put forth in the Synod of London (it was one of those already quoted, i. e. either Poynet's or Cranmer's), he replied:

"I grant that I saw the book, but I deny that I wrote it. I perused it after it was made, and *I noted many things for it, so I consented to the book.* I was not the author of it.

"Those articles were set out, I both writing and consenting to them. Mine own hand will testify the same; and Master Cranmer put his hand to them likewise, and gave them to others afterwards."

In his Farewell Letter he describes at large the characteristics of the Church of England as reformed, using such language as to show that, in his mind at least, it needed no further reformation. And in the same paper, taking leave of the See of London, he styles himself, "the chief minister of God's word, the Pastor and Bishop of the Diocese."

Defending himself from the charge of schism, he says:

"I know that the unity of the Church is to be retained by all means, and the same to be necessary to salvation. But I do

not take the mass, as it is at this day, for the communion of the Church, but for a Popish device," etc., etc. "The sect of the Anabaptists and the heresy of the Novatians ought of right to be condemned; forasmuch as, without any just or necessary cause, they wickedly separated themselves from the communion of the congregation."—(*Works, etc.*, p. 120, etc., etc., Parker Society Library.)

In his Articles of Inquiry, A.D. 1550, we have already found this question:

"Whether any of the Anabaptists' sect or other use notoriously any unlawful or private conventicles, wherein they do use doctrines or administration of Sacraments separating themselves from the rest of the parish?"

In the same document we have also this:

"Whether any minister useth wilfully and obstinately any other rite, ceremony, order, form or manner of communion, matins or even-song, ministration of Sacraments, or open prayers, than is set forth in the Book of Common Prayer."—(*Works*, p. 532.)

From these extracts we believe the reader will be able to form an idea of the side which this learned divine and noble martyr would have taken in such a controversy as the present.

WILLIAM TYNDALE, Translator of the Bible and Martyr.—Although Tyndale was put to death ten or eleven years before the Church of England was free and fully reformed, yet his writings were always in great esteem, and reprinted from time to time, under the auspices of eminent divines, such as Bale and Foxe, and had doubtless much to do in forming public opinion.

We do not know a single person of that period in England in whose works a greater number of severe sayings about Bishops, etc., might be found. Some of these might easily have been pressed into our author's service; possibly they *have* been in "the

larger work republished in this country in 1853," which we have never seen. In explanation of such passages, and of his whole treatise called "The Practice of Prelates," it is enough to say that he was bitterly persecuted by Bishops, and knew few, if any, of that Order, who were not Romish in doctrine and impure or cruel in character. The inducements then to catch hold of Jerome's mistake and decry the Order of Bishops were very strong, but yet Tyndale did not do it as he might have done; he could bear true testimony in the face of all. Thus he says:

"Paul in his Epistle, and also Peter, called the Prelates and spiritual governors, which are Bishops and Priests, Elders. Now, whether ye call them Elders or Priests, it is to me all one, so that ye understand that they be officers and servants of the word of God; unto the which all men, both high and low, [must be obedient,] that will not rebel against Christ, as long as they preach and rule truly, and no longer."—(*Prologue on St. Matthew, Doctrinal Treatises*, p. 479, Parker Soc.)

"Every man may be a common preacher, then, you will say, and preach everywhere by his own authority. NAY, VERILY, no man may yet be a common preacher, save he that is called and chosen thereto by the common ordinance of the Congregation."* "And though no man may preach openly, save he that hath the office committed unto him, yet ought every man to endeavor himself to be as well learned as the preacher, as nigh as it is possible. And every man may *privately* inform his neighbor; yea, and the *Preacher and Bishop* too, if need be."—(*Expository Treatises*, p. 36.)

On page 161 of the same volume, and elsewhere, we find him speaking of "the Bishops that succeeded the Apostles."

In "the Practice of Prelates" (same work, page 253) he undertakes to show what Orders the Apostles ordained in the Church. He points out the common

* "The kingdom of Heaven take for the Congregation or Church of Christ."—(*Tyndale Expository Treatises*, p. 40.)

use of the names Bishop and Presbyter for those of one class, and Deacon or Minister for those of another; and these two, with the Apostles, make up the three Orders which the Church preserves.

THOMAS BECON was one of Cranmer's chaplains. He was a voluminous writer, and his productions are generally excellent. In his Catechism, he gives to Timothy and Titus the title of "Bishop." He styles the Jewish High Priests "Bishops," and in various other such ways indicates his agreement in the doctrine and usage of the Church. When he comes to explain why the Church Catholic is called holy, he says it is to distinguish it from others that are unholy:

"The Ethnicks, the Jews, the Mahometans, the Anabaptists, the Arians, with all the rabble of heretics and sectaries, have their churches also; but all those churches are the synagogues of Satan," etc., etc.

Speaking of the Orders of ministers in the old dispensation, he calls them Bishops, Priests, and Levites, and refers to the history "of Dathan and Abiram," to show how grievously God did punish their great sin of disobedience. In his chapter on the ministry, he says:

"The Spiritual Magistrate—I mean the minister of God's word—is *the ordinance of God.*"

"A little before our Lord and Saviour Christ ascended with his body into the kingdom of his Father, he said to his Apostles, and *also to all their Successors*, which are all spiritual ministers that labor in word and doctrine, 'Teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc., etc.; 'And behold I am with you continually unto the world's end.'" "And St. Paul saith, God hath ordained in the Church, 'first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers,'" etc.

To the question whether every man that will may

take upon him the office of the ministry, the reply is:

"Nothing less; for St. Paul saith, How shall they preach, except they be sent?" "Those that take upon them the ministry before they be called are of the number of those whom God, by the prophet, describeth in this manner: 'I sent them not, and they ran; I spake not unto them, and they preached.'"

As to the modes of calling to the ministry, he says there are two:

"One is when they be called immediately of God, as the prophets and Apostles were which were raised up of God to prophesy and to teach, without any vocation or calling of man. And this kind of vocation God useth customably outwardly to approve and confirm with wonderful testimonies and signs, as we may more see in Moses, Helias, etc. But this calling hath now ceased. The other is when the ministers be called *mediately*, as they say, and in order of men, that is to say of the [spiritual] magistrate of the people."

To the question, "What is the difference between a Bishop and a spiritual minister?" he answers:

"None at all. Their office is one; their authority and power is one."

But that this reply does not involve the Presbyterian theory of parity is very evident, as in a subsequent paragraph, on the same page, he says that St. Paul

"Unto BISHOP Titus writeth thus: For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest reform the things that are unperfect, and *shouldest ordain Elders in every city.*"

And in similar mode, all through his works, he gives to the Bishop the position always assigned to him, as separate from and superior to the Presbyter. Thus he speaks of the "Honorable Bishops and holy Fathers which lived after the Apostles' time," "the Bishops and Ministers of Christ's Church," etc., etc.—(*Catechism, etc.*, Parker Society Library.)

ROGER HUTCHINSON, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, A. D. 1550:

"I do not mean that every man or woman may christen, marry, purify women, may loose and bind consciences, may distribute the holy Sacrament, but I mean that Popish and outward priesthood is crept into the Church of God against the word of God; and I do believe and confess *no more Orders of ministers but* THREE, that is, DEACONS, PRESBYTERS, and BISHOPS. *These three the Scripture alloweth,** and shewed the manner of their creation and declareth their office and duties."—(*On Image of God, etc.*, Parker Society, p. 50.)

BISHOP ALLEY, Exeter; consecrated July 14, 1560.—Strangely enough, Mr. Goode begins his Catena with this now almost wholly forgotten divine, because *the order of time demands it!* He quotes from him nothing more than that mistake of Jerome's, of which we have already spoken, and even in making that quotation he prefers not giving "Jerome's words in full." We regret very much that a copy of Alley's works cannot be procured in this country; not that we attach particular importance to his opinion, but because we are inclined to think that some other portions of his book would speak a different language from that in the passage, as quoted by Mr. Goode. But, taking his words just as they are given, we find in them nothing that cannot be easily explained.

"These words are alleged, that it may appear Priests among the Elders to have been *even the same that Bishops were.* But it grew by little and little that the whole charge and cure should be appointed to one Bishop within his precinct, that the seeds of dissension might utterly be rooted out."

In connection with this we remark, that it refers entirely to Apostolic times. (1) No Churchman

* The verb "allow" meant much more in former times than it does now. Above, it means to sanction and something more, to appoint, to authorize.

denies that in the New Testament the names Episcopos and Presbyteros are used interchangeably, and applied to ministers of the second Order; but the admission of this does not at all affect the evidence for a higher Order, to which, in the Post-Apostolic age the title of "Bishop" was confined. (2) Supposing that it *did* grow by little and little* that the whole charge was given to one Bishop within his district, this change took place *within the times of the Apostles*, and under their influence. Jerome makes it evident that this is his own meaning, for he refers to changes following from "one saying I am of Paul, and another I of Apollos," which, we take for granted, Mr. Goode will confess to have been before the death of St. Paul, who tells us of it. But if the Apostles sanctioned or made the change, it was divinely instituted.

BISHOP PILKINGTON. — As may be supposed, from what has been said in the last chapter, we attach no great value to the opinions of this divine upon the subject of Church order. It is from such as he was that our author gets "much stronger testimony" than even Alley can supply; but it will go for little with any who bear in mind that he was criminally negligent of his Episcopal duty, and left his cathedral and diocese in such utter disorder that they were likened to an "Augean stable." Still we are not afraid to take up what Mr. Goode quotes from him, and give it full consideration. The gist of it is in the following sentences:

---

* St. Jerome, Comment on Galatians i. 19.

"Paulatim vero tempore," etc., etc. "*By little and little, in process of time, others also were ordained* APOSTLES *by those whom the Lord had chosen.*" — (Quoted in *Presbyterian Clergyman looking for the Church*, p. 477.)

"But this is to be understood, that the privileges and superiorities, which Bishops have above other ministers, are rather granted by men for maintaining of better order and quietness in commonwealths than commanded by God in His word. Ministers have better knowledge and utterance some than other, but their ministry is of equal dignity. God's commission and commandment is alike indifferent to all, Priest, Bishop, Archbishop, Prelate, by what name soever he be called."

Here our author stops. He inserts a few dots to stand in the place of six lines in the original, which we consider too important to be omitted. The last sentence is certainly very strong, and as we read it in Mr. Goode's work we naturally conclude that Pilkington believed that God's commission, etc., *was in every respect* alike to Bishop and Priest, and, knowing his history, we are not surprised that he should think so; but, if we turn from Mr. Goode to Pilkington himself, we find that he meant nothing of the sort. He was not speaking of authority in general, or in *all* its departments, but of authority to discharge the *ordinary work* of a Christian minister. His sentence does not end with "called," as our author makes it, but goes on describing or quoting the commission; and *this* portion, which shows his meaning, is wholly omitted. Here are the lines which our author did not think it necessary or advisable to print:

"Go and teach, baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; and again, Whose sins soever ye forgive, they are forgiven, and whatsoever ye loose in earth, it is loosed in heaven, etc." "Likewise the Lord's Supper, by *whomsoever, being* LAWFULLY *called*, it be ministered, it is of like strength, power, and holiness."

At this point Mr. Goode resumes. He makes, in the same quotation, two other omissions, that are of similar character, and evidently designed, so that we

find the Reverend gentleman unwilling to trust his own witness.

The reader, who considers what is now laid before him, will perceive that the original writer did not mean to assert that *in all things* Bishops and Priests are equal, but in their power to preach the Gospel, to administer Sacrament, and to "absolve from sins."* The equality *does* exist, as far as the ordinary ministry is concerned,† but no farther—of government in the Church or the power of ordination not a word is said in the whole passage. It has no immediate bearing, then, upon our subject; it is only made to appear as if it had by skilful management.

But let us hear the Bishop's sentiments on the necessity of strict discipline, and on the authority which exists of right, and ought to be enforced.

Speaking of certain parties who "willingly excommunicate themselves and will come at no congregation," he says:

"God grant all such obstinate contemners of His Church and His word their *just and deserved discipline!* This *overmuch softness that is used*, and an opinion of some that be zealous in religion, whereby *they think that they may not punish an ill man for his conscience and religion*, DOTH MUCH HARM, *and emboldeneth them in their ill doings.* Surely, in my opinion, they that have authority, and will not correct such wilful dealings, be partakers and maintainers of others' ill-doing, and fill both the Church and commonwealth with disobedient persons."—(*Works*, Parker Society, p. 382.)

These are strong words. Suppose Laud had written them. What bursts of indignation they would have

* In one of the sentences omitted by Mr. Goode, Pilkington ridicules the idea that a Priest may absolve small sins, and that "greater belong to the Bishop; the Archbishop claims another higher sort," etc., etc.

† Equality, "*quoad ministerium*," is what Jerome really claims, and what all Churchmen grant.

excited! what outcries against intolerance! But inasmuch as they are from the pen of a good "Germanical" Bishop, and as his desire was to force obedience upon "Papists," rather than "Puritans," there is, of course, no censure!

In the same work from which we have just quoted he gives his judgment against the Puritan discipline, at that time "so vehemently urged," and shows, from the analogy of his subject (the building of the walls of Jerusalem), that in the Lord's work every company of workmen should have their overseer; and overseer is simply the English of Episcopus.

In his Confutation, etc., from which Mr. Goode has taken these passages above, he says:

"To be a Bishop is to be an Officer, a ruler, a guide, a teacher of God's flock in God's Church, and to be a *true* successor in a bishopric is to succeed in like pains, care, and diligent regard of God's people. Is he an officer that does not his office?" (Page 604, etc.)

Here he is arguing against "succession of persons and place" as useless unless associated with soundness of doctrine and zealous discharge of duty. But that even *he* did not "repudiate" the "theory of Apostolical Succession" is sufficiently evident from the following.

"Does Cyprian make any more for his purpose? Mark his words and judge. 'They that be made Bishops (says he) out of the Church and *not by tradition of the* APOSTLES *by* SUCCESSION, are not Bishops, but thieves,' etc. *I am content to be judged by these words.* I proved afore by Paul and Timothy, by Dionysius, etc., that the Order by which our Bishops and Priests are made now is more agreeing to the order of the Church in Cyprian's time and tradition of the Apostles, than that misorder whereby the Popish prelates order [ordain] their clergy."

This, then, after all, is the real doctrine of the man

whose "much stronger testimony" on his own side Mr. Goode professed to give. We are sincerely obliged to him for requiring us to bring it forth.*

Before taking leave of "My Lord of Durham" and Bishop Alley, we must correct another of our author's errors. He says

"Both these were among the Bishops who settled our Articles on the accession of Queen Elizabeth."

That event took place November, 1558, and the Convocation which "settled our articles" did not sit for two years after. If, instead of it, our author refers to the Commission appointed in 1559 to revise the Liturgy, *neither* Pilkington nor Alley was a Bishop at the time. The former, however, was on the Commission; the latter was not. If he does mean the Convocation which met in 1560, Alley was a member of it, and Pilkington was not. In either case his statement is incorrect.

BISHOP JEWEL.—The next divine to whom Mr. Goode appeals is the illustrious author of the Apology from which we gave extracts in the last chapter. He quotes (on page 32) two long paragraphs from Jewel's "Defence" of the former work. Of the first of these quotations we shall not speak more than this: it is marked by omissions of the kind we have described, and yet, even as our author prints it, it does not give an inkling of the Bishop's own views. His opponent, Harding, stated that to deny the difference between a Bishop and a Priest was heresy. Jewel retorts that by this saying he con-

* Pilkington ends the paragraph from which we quote, with these words: "Thus, like a foolish boy, he has gotten a rod to beat himself withal; God send him more wit."

demns some even of the saints and fathers of the Church, and he might have added, many of the theologians of the Roman Sect; but in this rebuke to Harding he did not say a word that would commit himself to the opinions he quotes. That his estimate of the Episcopate was not what our author asserts, may be learned from the following extracts:

"I grant Bishops may be called the heads of their several Churches."

"Optatus saith 'there be four sorts of heads in the Church: the Bishops, the Priests, the Deacons, the faithful (or laity)'" (*Def. Apol, Parker Soc'y*, p. 269.) "His own Anacletus saith * * * 'more than these two Orders of Priests (Bishops and Elders) neither hath God appointed us, nor have the Apostles taught us.' And yet of *these same two several Orders, St. Hierome seemeth to make only one Order;* for thus he writeth * * * 'I hear say there is a man broken out into such wilful fury that he placeth Deacons before Priests, that is to say before Bishops. And again * * * 'The Apostle Paul especially teacheth us that Priests and Bishops be all one.' *The same St. Hierome*, writing upon the prophet Esay, reckoneth only FIVE ORDERS or degrees in the whole Church: the Bishops, the Priests, the Deacons, the enterers or beginners, and the faithful; and other Order of the Church he knoweth none."

He then gives the same quotations from Jerome to which we have referred so often: "Idem est Presbyter qui Episcopus," etc., etc., and proceeds:

"Clemens saith: * * * * 'the mysteries of the holy secrecies be committed unto three Orders; that is unto the Priests, unto the Deacons, and unto the Ministers, and yet Deacons and Ministers, as touching the name, are all one. Dionysius, likewise, hath three Orders, but not the same; for he reckoneth Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And whereas Mr. Harding maketh his account of four of the less or inferior Orders, meaning thereby Ostiarios, Lectores, Exorcistas, Acoluthos. His own Ignatius addeth thereto three other Orders, Cantatores, Laboratores, Confitentes," etc., etc.—(Page 272.)

"In this so great dissention and darkness, what way will Mr. Harding take to follow? By Anacletus there be two Orders; by Clemens and St. Hierome, three; by counterfeit Hierome, seven; by others, eight; by others, nine; by others, ten." (Page 272, 273.)

Jewel then proceeds to argue against and ridicule the four minor Orders contended for by his antagonist, but writes not a syllable against the THREE ORDERS "which Christ hath ordained in his Church."

When Harding asserts that English Bishops have neither Order nor Consecration, Jewel notes in the margin: "A manifest untruth; for we have both." And then replies in the text:

"He thought if he could make the world believe we have neither Bishops, nor Priests, nor Deacons this day in the Church of England, he might then the more easily claim the whole right unto himself."—(Page 322.)

Again on page 334 he thus addresses Harding:

"Whereas it further pleases you to call for my letters of orders, and to demand of me whether I be a Priest or no? what hands were laid over me; and by what order I was made? I answer you, I AM A PRIEST, made long since by the same order and ordinance, and I think, also by the same man and the same hands that you, Mr. Harding, were made Priest by, in the late time of that most virtuous Prince, King Edward the sixth; therefore ye cannot well doubt of my priesthood without like doubting of your own."

"Further, as if ye were my metropolitan, ye demand of me whether I be a Bishop or no? I answer you, I AM A BISHOP, and that by the free and accustomed Canonical election of the whole chapter of Sarisbury assembled together for that purpose. Our Bishops are made in form and order as they have been ever by free election of the chapter; by *consecration* of the Archbishop and other three Bishops, and by the admission of the Prince."

"Therefore we neither have Bishops without Church, NOR CHURCH WITHOUT BISHOPS. Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them whom you often call apostates, as if our Church were no Church without them. . . . If there were not one, neither of them nor of us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole Church of England flee to Lovaine, Tertullian saith: 'And we being laymen, are we not Priests? It is written, Christ hath made us both a kingdom and Priest unto God his Father. The authority of the Church, and the honor by the assembly, or council of order sanctified of God, hath made a difference between the lay and the clergy. Where,

as there is no assembly of ecclesiastical order, the Priest being there alone (without the company of other Priests) doth minister the oblation and also baptize; yea, and be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet is there a Church. For every man liveth of his own faith."

Mr. Goode quotes this, and says significantly: "It is needless to point out how much this passage implies." Notwithstanding which, we very sincerely wish he *had* pointed it out; for *insinuations* are harder to deal with than plain statements. We presume the gravamen of it is found, as he seems to believe, in (1) the reference to Lovaine, and (2) to laymen constituting a Church.

Now of the first the meaning is *not* as Mr. Goode's Italics suggest: that if there were no true Bishops in the English Church, *they would not accept authority* or *succession from Romish Prelates,* but simply this, in which we most heartily join with him; *even the total want of Bishops would not compel us to fly to Lovaine* [*i. e. to turn Romanist and go there as Harding had done*]; *we would rather depend on our prayers, rather fall back upon our personal priesthood, than become apostates.*

The other point which Mr. Goode thinks so plainly in his favor, and which some persons regard as indicating very loose views of the ministry, has no such meaning. It is well known that laymen were addressed in Scripture as a "priesthood," and called upon to offer themselves as living sacrifices unto the Lord; but surely no one holds, on that account, that all laymen are in *the true sacerdotal or ministerial Order.* Now it is to *this* sort of a priesthood, and to a Church consisting of such only, that Jewel spoke of resorting rather than apostatize. He does not say that a society

of such Christian men would be a Church in the full and proper sense of the term; nor does he desire for a moment to deny or interfere with the sacred Orders of the ministry, though Mr. Goode insinuates, and his followers think, that that is his veritable meaning. Let us hear his own words, as they appear on the same page:

"But ye tell us 'There is a priesthood internal, and a priesthood external; and *there is a difference between laymen and priests.*' WHAT NEEDED THIS TALK, MR. HARDING? *There is not one of us that ever taught otherwise.* We know that the priest or minister of the Church of God is divided from the rest of his brethren, as was the tribe of Levi from the children of Israel, and hath a special office over the people. *Neither may any man force himself into that office without lawful calling.* But as touching the *inward priesthood* and exercise of the soul, we say, even as St. Peter and St. John and Tertullian have said: *In this sense every faithful christian man is a priest,* and offereth unto God spiritual sacrifices. *In this sense* ONLY, I say, and *not otherwise.*"—(Page 336.)

So much, then, for the artful suggestion (or else the very singular mistake) of our author. We have given up considerable space to this vindication of the eminent Apologist, but not more than his worth demands. We close our quotations from him with this pregnant sentence:

"We SUCCEED the Bishops that have been before our days. We are elected, CONSECRATED, confirmed, and admitted as they were. If they were deceived in anything, we succeed them in place, but not in error."—(P. 339.)

ARCHBISHOP PARKER.—The judgment of this second Protestant Primate may be gathered from what has been given in the Ninth chapter. We subjoin a few brief extracts, however, for the purpose of making this chain complete.

In 1560, Nicholas Heathe, (deprived) Archbishop

of York, and others of the Romish clergy, wrote a letter threatening all the Reformed Bishops and Ministers with the Pope's displeasure, excommunication, etc. To this Parker replied by showing the absurdity and arrogance of the Bishop of Rome in presuming to judge or lord it over others of the same Order as himself. In this letter he makes the profession usually made by the English Reformers, of willingness to leave all disputed matters to the test of Holy Scripture and Christian antiquity; and he speaks with pride of those British Bishops who in old time repudiated the claims of the Bishop of Rome. He then adds:

"I and the rest of our brethren, the Bishops and Clergy of the realm, supposed ye to be our brethren in Christ. But we are sorry that ye, through your perverseness, have *separated yourselves not only from us*, but from those ancient fathers and their opinions."—(*Correspondence*, page 112.)

We shall not quote any of his very numerous complaints of the troubles and turmoils of what he calls those *exulceratissima tempora*. These have been sufficiently referred to already. The following is from one of his letters to Cecil describing his reception and intercourse with the French Ambassador:

"The substance of his inquisition was much for the order and using of our religion, *the peculiarities whereof I discoursed unto him*. He noted much, and *delighted in our mediocrity*, charging the *Genevians* and the *Scotch of going too far in extremity*. I perceive they thought, before their coming, we had neither *status preces*, nor choice days of abstinence, as Lent, etc., nor *Orders ecclesiastical*, etc., etc. And thereupon * * * *I did beat that plainly out of their heads.*"—(P. 215.)

I signified unto them that we had both Bishops and Priests, married and not married, every man at his liberty * * *. In fine, they professed that we were in religion very nigh to them. I answered that *I would wish them to come nigher to us*, grounding ourselves (as we do) upon the *Apostolical doctrine and pure time of the Primitive Church.*"

In his joint letter with Sandys to another Bishop he says:

"God hath placed us to be *governors in His Church*, hath committed unto us a care and charge thereof, and will one day require a reckoning at our hands for the same. Seeing that *God's cause* is brought into question, and the Church many ways troubled, we must, with good courage, stand to the defence thereof, and resist the underminers."—(*Correspondence*, p. 435.)

ARCHBISHOP WHITGIFT.—Grindal succeeded Parker in the Primacy, and on his demise Whitgift entered upon the office, A. D. 1584.

We scarcely know how to characterize the treatment which this great champion of the Church has received from our author. He is first mentioned on page 29 thus:

"Archbishop Whitgift held (as we shall show presently) that Bishops and Priests are, strictly speaking, of the same Order."

An assertion thus positively made with promise of proof, is received by the confiding reader as sufficient. He does not doubt that Whitgift believed just as Mr. Goode states, although such a representation of his views is very different from any he may have had before; he cannot for a moment suppose that a thing asserted so plainly could be without foundation, and therefore he yields belief in advance of proof. On page 33 the promised evidence is furnished, and it amounts to just *nothing!* Read it as it appears in Mr. Goode's work, and the fair verdict must be "*not proven.*" Whitgift quotes Jerome (to the effect so often mentioned) but does not afford the least warrant for the statement that *he* believed in a parity of order in Bishop and Presbyter. Mr. Goode then goes on to quote Whitgift's opinions on Church government, but not another word of evidence is

furnished as to his views of *ordination*, and yet on page 85 our author uses the following language, emphasizing it as he well knows how to do:

"Archbishop Whitgift (* * as we know from his writings) *admitted the* VALIDITY of the *Orders of the Foreign Protestant Churches!*"

The reader will please turn back for a moment to page 231, and there he will see what such a statement is worth. Thus we have a certain thing asserted boldly on the strength of evidence yet to come, no such evidence really furnished, and yet afterwards (as if it had been) even a *greater thing* claimed, and set forth with all the force which types can give!

But we have not yet done with those quotations. Happening to know that *Cartwright wished to establish the very parity of Order for which our author contends*, and that Whitgift opposed him, we wondered how Mr. Goode had managed to make the latter speak his opponent's language; but comparison of our author's quotation with the original made it very clear; and, knowing that the reader will admire the dexterity displayed in the matter, we place both before him, thus:

Mr. GOODE says:	Archbishop WHITGIFT says:
"As to the parity of Order in Bishops and Priests, he [Whitgift] speaks thus:	
"'Every bishop is a priest, but every priest hath not *the name and title* of a bishop, in that meaning that Jerome in this place [*Ad Evagr.*] taketh the name of a bishop. . . . Neither shall you find this word *episcopus* commonly used	"Every bishop is a priest, but every priest hath not the name and title of a bishop, in that meaning that Jerome in this place taketh the name of a bishop. . . . Neither shall you find this word *Episcopus* commonly used but for that

but for *that priest that is in degree over and above the rest*, notwithstanding *episcopus* be oftentimes called *presbyter*, because *presbyter* is *the more general name.*'"—(*Essay on Orders*, p. 33.)

priest that is in degree over and above the rest, notwithstanding *Episcopus* be often called *Presbyter*, because Presbyter is the more *general* name; so that *M. Doctor* [WHITGIFT] *saith truly that it is with us one thing to be a Bishop, another thing to be a Priest;* because every Bishop is a Priest, *but every* PRIEST *is not a* BISHOP!"

"I know these names be *confounded in* the Scriptures, but I speak according to the manner and custom of the Church ever since the Apostles' time."—(*Whitgift's Works*, Vol. ii., p. 252.)

So that the first of the two quotations shows us Mr. Doctor saying precisely the contrary of what is ascribed to him. Let us now turn to the other.

WHITGIFT QUOTED BY GOODE.

"Although Hierome confess, that by Scripture *presbyter* and *episcopus* is all one (AS IN DEED

WHITGIFT HIMSELF.*

"You [Cartwright] untruly report of Hierome, for he speaketh of a Deacon, not of an Archdeacon. But it is your manner so to deal. Surely, I marvel that you will utter so manifest untruths. But if Hierome should so say, yet is your argument nothing; for though an Archdeacon be inferior to a Minister (whom you call Elder), yet *doth not that prove but that there may be degrees among the Ministers*, and *that the chiefest of them in authority may be called a Bishop;* as Hierome also in that epistle declareth.

"And although Hierome confess that by Scripture *Presbyter* and *Episcopus* is all one

* Italics, etc., are ours.

THEY BE *quoad ministerium*,) yet doth he acknowledge a superiority of the bishop before the minister. . . . . .

Therefore no doubt this is Jerome's mind, that a bishop *in degree and dignity* is above the minister, though he be one and the self-same with him in the office of ministering the word and sacraments."—(*Essay on Orders*, p. 33.)

(as indeed they be *quoad ministerium*), yet doth he acknowledge a superiority of the Bishop before the Minister. For besides these places that I have alleged in my answer to the Admonition, he saith thus in the same epistle * * the one is a name of age and the other of dignity. And a little after * * *The Elder is contained in the Bishop.* Therefore, no doubt this is Jerome's mind, that a Bishop, in degree and dignity, IS *above the Minister*, though he be one and the selfsame with him in the office of ministering the word and Sacraments; and therefore he saith, *Presbyter continetur in Episcopo;* because every Bishop is a Presbyter, but *every* PRESBYTER *is* NOT A BISHOP!"—(*Whitgift*, vol. ii., p. 254.)

This is the way in which an expert controversialist can make white appear black. It is, on the whole, one of the most skilful performances of its kind that we have ever seen. But let us hear more from the Archbishop:

"It is not to be denied but that there is an equality of all ministers of God's word *quoad ministerium*, 'touching the ministry,' for they have all like power to preach the word, to minister the Sacraments. * * * But *quoad* ORDINEM *et politiam*, 'touching ORDER *and* GOVERNMENT,' *there always have been and must be degrees and superiority among them.*"—(*Ibid.*, p. 265.)

"In all these places Hierome doth not maintain the authority of *one man* [a Pope] over the whole Church, but thinketh it necessary that in every province there be one to be chief over the rest, for unity sake, and for rooting out of contentions and sects. And therefore, *contra Luciferianos*, he saith, that unless this superiority were, there would be as many schisms in the Church as there be Priests."—(P. 222.)

On this it might be remarked that it makes Epis-

copacy appear no more than a prudential human arrangement, but elsewhere Whitgift shows, from the reference to St. Paul's mention of the schisms at Corinth, that it was in St. Paul's day, and of course appointed by him and the other Apostles, and therefore *a divine* arrangement. And when Cartwright (anticipating the course of those who now-a-days ingeniously argue that "*from* the Apostles' time" means "since or after their time") says, with reference to another quotation, "the words 'from Mark' may be rather taken exclusively to shut out St. Mark and the time wherein he lived," Whitgift replies, that this is but "a dallying" with Jerome's words.

"The place is evident; he saith 'from the time of Mark the Evangelist,' whom undoubtedly he would not have named, unless the manner had been *in* his time."—(P. 250.)

"Notwithstanding that part of the office of the Apostles is ceased which consisted in planting and founding of churches throughout the world, yet *this part* of GOVERNMENT and direction of churches remaineth still, and is *committed to Bishops!* Therefore, saith Ambrose * * * 'Apostoli Episcopi sunt.' Apostles are Bishops, because BISHOPS DO SUCCEED *them* in preaching the word and *governing* the Church."—(P. 230.)

Here again we offer a sentence or two upon Order, which, of course, Mr. Goode did not see:

"Chrysostom in that place maketh degrees in the ministry, and placeth the Bishop in degree above the minister; *which utterly overthroweth your equality.*"—(P. 20.) "This superiority that Chrysostom talketh of overthroweth that part of the Admonition that I confute; for they do not only disallow the office of the Archbishop, but of the Bishop also, and would have *a mere equality* among the ministers. *This I* REPEL, *as well as the other.*" "Chrysostom * * * giveth as much superiority to the Bishop as I do, and maketh as much difference between him and the minister; for I grant that *quoad ministeriam* they be all one, but that there be degrees of dignity. And so saith Chrysostom, that 'there is little difference betwixt a Bishop and a Priest, but that *a* BISHOP *hath authority* TO ORDAIN *Priests;* and all *other* things that the Bishop may do the Priest

also may do, THAT EXCEPTED;' so that Chrysostom here speaketh only of the ministry of the Bishop, not of his authority in the ecclesiastical government," etc., etc.—(P. 261.)

These extracts render it unnecessary for us to add a word upon the subjects they touch. But there is another intimately allied to them, which our author has made one of his strong points. He claims that the great Archbishop, whose long life was spent in the service and defence of the Church of England, regarded the whole question of polity as one of little consequence, and even confessed that no one kind of Church government is so established by Scripture authority as to claim the allegiance of all men. In making this representation the Reverend gentleman treads in the footsteps of the Presbyterian advocate, Dr. Miller, and is followed in turn by those who have of late undertaken to defend his theory.*

The language of certain passages in Whitgift's Defence of his Answer is of such a character as to give a sort of warrant to these representations, as the reader will perceive. His opponent, Cartwright, contended that *his* favorite scheme of discipline had Scriptural, and therefore exclusive warrant, so that its acceptance was, as Mr. Goode states, "necessary to salvation." On this point Whitgift says:

"I confess that in a Church collected together in one place, and at liberty, government is necessary in the second kind of

* We refer here particularly to the Rev. Messrs. Gallagher and Canfield. The latter, without quoting any one passage to this effect, mentions Whitgift among those whose testimony *"might be adduced"* to confirm his theory.—(See *Review*, etc., p. 16, and *Gallagher on Apostolical Succession*, p. 26.)

Mr. Powell, the Methodist advocate, did not try to use Whitgift's words to contradict his life, but, to our surprise, we find even Dr. J. C. Smith doing so. He confesses, however, that he quotes not from the original, but from Mr. Goode.

necessity; but that any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny, and the reasons that move me so to do be these. The first is, because *I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ*, which no doubt should have been done, if it had been a matter *necessary unto the salvation of the Church.*"

And again, as our author quotes:

"I deny that the Scriptures do * * * set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places without alteration."—(*Goode on Orders*, p. 33.)

We readily acknowledge that nothing could appear more fairly cited than these sentences, and that they seem strongly to favor our author's scheme. Accepting them as correct, the reader may think it strange that Whitgift should oppose or surrender on one page the very position which he has maintained on another, and he may be inclined to regard the great Archbishop as too inconsistent to be worthy of attention. But let such judgment be deferred for a little.

We might very reasonably deny that such quotations tell against us, inasmuch as it has not been asserted or supposed that Episcopacy is "necessary to salvation." But though this would be a perfectly correct statement, and a fair way of meeting such assertions as those in the passages cited, it is not our reply. We shall not answer Archbishop Whitgift thus, until we find that he has given us occasion. This he has not done. We deny, in the most positive manner, that *he ever meant* what those passages from his work *appear to mean*, and are put forward to support. The whole quotation is unfair; it is a per-

fect specimen of the class described in our second chapter, page 30.

In this controversy, now-a-days, "government" has a definite or technical meaning. If we say that a person looks upon "Church government" as a matter of little importance, we mean that he sets no value upon [say] the Episcopal more than Presbyterian or the Congregational form of polity. It is very natural, therefore, when one reads such sentences as those quoted by Mr. Goode, to put upon them the interpretation he wishes, viz.: to regard the Archbishop as declaring that it makes really no great difference whether a Church retains Episcopacy or not! But very far from this was the judgment of him whom Fuller calls "the worthiest man that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy." Such could not be the opinion expressed in a book which excited the wrath of the Puritans by its maintaining the calling of Bishops to be "by the word of God," "superior to other ministers of Christ." *

What, then, is the true sense of the passages in question? We will reply to this by showing that the word "government" is not used in them with reference to the question of "Bishop versus Presbyter," but in its large and general sense of rule, order, jurisdiction, or management. It is used to embrace everything connected with the *general principles of constitution*, and *with the details of discipline* or *mode of administration*. †

* Strype's Whitgift, fol. 304.

† We have already referred to the word "Succession" as an instance of a term frequently understood as bearing, in quotations from old writers, a very different meaning from what they intended to convey. Many other such instances might be given. The saying "We are sore

Ex. Gratia:

'If you mean that the Government of the Church is spiritual because God by His Spirit's gifts and ministry of His word doth govern it, you say truly, * * * but if you mean that there need be no *civil magistrate, no civil and politic laws, no external discipline, no outward ceremonies and orders*, you are greatly deceived."—(Vol. iii., p. 420.)

These things, then, are all included in the one word "government."

"Christ is the Head of the Church and spiritually governeth the same in the conscience: but because it hath also an outward and visible form, therefore it requireth an outward and visible government, which Christ doth execute as well by the *civil magistrate* as he doth by the ecclesiastical minister."—(*Ibid*, 419.)

These extracts are sufficient to show that the word is used in a "large and general sense," and that Whitgift did not *necessarily* refer to the constitution of the ministry or to the debates upon that point. The same

---

let and hindered" sounds now-a-days like a contradiction; and "*preventing* grace," if not looked upon as "*restraining* grace," is a mystery! It is evident, then, that if these or other words whose application has changed in the lapse of years, are understood in their modern sense, they do not give the meaning of the author from whom they are taken, and that a skilful quoter might use them to prove exactly the opposite of what the writer wished to maintain.—Take another instance:

We have had a belligerent Bishop among us of late; but if Mr. Goode's mode of quoting were allowed, it would be an easy matter to show that there was nothing unlawful or strange in that; for Richard Hooker and Bishop Bilson testify that in their day there was a "Regiment of Bishops!" And John Knox testifies to the use of Amazons in Scotland in his trumpet-blast against "the Monstrous Regiment of Women!"

Just as "regiment" would be misused if so quoted, "government" is misused by our Author. That it bore the *general* meaning explained above is very easily proved by a reference to writers of the period in question. Thus Sampson, the puritan, "By Government, I mean, not the touch of the princely authority in the Church of Christ." "But I speak of that reforming of the *regiment* with the doctors, proctors, chancellors, officials, and such officers that have and execute according to canonical and Romish law."—(*Strype's Parker*, III., p. 317.)

Bishop Cooper, in his Admonition, calls it "*œconomia ecclesiæ*," "external government, form of jurisdiction." (See p. 115.) Hooker also uses it in the same sense, as we shall see.

thing is evident from the following in his "Table of Dangerous Doctrines."

"The essential points of ecclesiastical government may well agree with any lawful state of commonwealth and civil kind of government; as the gospel may be truly preached in them all, the sacraments rightly ministered, discipline duly executed, and such like: but the accidental points of government (as the manner of electing ministers, the kind of discipline, accidental ceremonies, and other such rites and ceremonies) may be varied according to time, place, and persons, and are so to be framed as they may best agree with the state and government of every commonwealth."—(Vol. III., pp. 554, 5.)

The reader will observe here (1) that in his own full definition of the word as he is using it, he makes no mention of either Presbyter or Bishop; the question of "parity or imparity" is not before his mind at all; and (2) that where he speaks of government which "may be varied according to time, place, persons, etc.," he refers only to the accidents of polity, ceremonies, details of discipline, etc. Of the threefold constitution of the sacred ministry he never uses such language.

If we turn now to volume I. we will find that, in the very place from which our author has quoted, Whitgift has used the word government in the sense we have just shown, and in no other. Cartwright was advocating the establishment of his own pet system, which involved a presbyterial consistory with right of discipline, excommunication, etc., over all lay people, and certain mode of performing the ordinances of worship, and urging this as having divine authority and being therefore necessary to salvation. To this Whitgift replies:

"You add that 'excommunication and other censures of the Church which are forerunners unto excommunication, are matters of discipline, and the same are also of faith and of salva-

tion.' There are two kinds of government in the Church, the one invisible and the other visible; the one spiritual, the other external * * * * The visible and external government is that which is executed by man, and consisteth of *external discipline* and *visible ceremonies* practised in the Church. If you mean *this kind of government* then must I ask you this question, Whether your meaning is, that to have a government is necessary to salvation; or to have *some one certain form and kind of government* not to be altered in respect of time, persons, or place? Likewise would I know of you what you mean by 'necessary to salvation?' whether you mean such things without the which we cannot be saved, or such things only as be necessary helps unto salvation? For you know that this word "necessary" signifieth either, that without the which a thing cannot be, or that without the which it cannot so well and conveniently be.

"But forsomuch as you afterwards make mention of excommunication and other censures of the Church * * * I take it that you mean the *external* government and *that* 'kind of government.' And yet must I ask you another question, that is, whether you mean that this government * * * is necessary at all times, or then [only] when the Church is collected together and in such place where it may have government. For you know that the Church is sometimes by persecution so dispersed that it appeareth not * * * nor hath any certain place to remain in: so that it *cannot have any external government or exercise of any discipline.* But to be short, [and HERE Mr. Goode's quotation begins] I confess that in a Church collected together and at liberty, government is necessary in the second kind of necessity [that is, as a help]; but that *any one kind of government* is so necessary that without it the Church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny."—(*Works*, Vol. I., pp. 183, 184.)

It is manifest, then, that in the quotation we are considering, Whitgift speaks of what we should call "discipline" or "order" or "general economy," and NOT what is now meant when we speak of "Church government;" and that the subject of "THREE ORDERS or *one*," "Episcopacy or Presbytery," was not at all before his mind. So evident is this, that we profess our inability to understand how Mr. Goode could make such a *mistake* as he has done in quoting the

passage to prove that Whitgift regarded Episcopacy as a thing indifferent!

In the paragraph immediately following our author's quotation, the Archbishop says:

"That kind of government and discipline that you mean, that is excommunication!" "If excommunication (which is a kind of government) be necessary to salvation, then any man may separate himself from every Church wherein is no excommunication."

This surely would have corrected the mistake if our author had happened to see it. Indeed, we think that it ought to have been corrected by some words which he must have seen, as he has taken the trouble to omit them from the short paragraph he gives on page 34.

Mr. GOODE quotes:

"I deny that the Scriptures do . . . . . set down any one certain form and kind of government of the Church, to be perpetual for all times, persons, and places without alteration."

WHITGIFT says:

"Yet do I deny that the Scriptures *do express particularly* EVERYTHING *that is to be done in the Church* (which you yourself afterwards confess), or that it doth set down any one certain form," etc., etc., etc.

Such, then, is the way in which Mr. Goode quotes Whitgift to show that he allows "the equality of Bishops and Presbyters *jure divino*." But that anything like such an interpretation can be put upon his language, is utterly denied. We are willing, however, to regard our author's course as occasioned by misconception of Whitgift's meaning; if not that, it is something much worse.

And now, (since we indignantly refuse to accept those passages as expressing the Archbishop's views on the subject we are discussing) we feel obliged to quote a few sentences of what he has written expressly upon it.

"The admonition * * * affirmeth that 'the right of ordering ministers doth at no hand appertain to the Bishop." This do I improve in this place, and prove that *the right of ordering* and electing ministers DOTH appertain to the Bishop; but I have contented myself with the fewer proofs, because their assertion is so absurd that it cannot but discredit their learning with all learned men."—(*Tract* iii., Chap. vii.)

Treating of the Apostle's charge to Timothy (5th Chapter 1st Epistle, etc.), he says:

"The words are spoken of Timothy in respect that he was a Bishop; neither hath the Apostle given any such like admonition to any Church in any of his epistles."

He then goes on to quote Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Œcumenius, and adds:

"Whereby it plainly appeareth that these ancient fathers think this precept, 'Lay thy hands suddenly on no man,' to be given only to Timothy in respect that he was a Bishop, and therefore also to *appertain unto* BISHOPS ONLY to ordain ministers."—(Vol. i., p. 433.)

Having quoted Jerome to the same effect, he says:

"Hierome here taketh the Bishop *only* to have authority to ordain and appoint ministers."

Chrysostom is again cited, and Theophylact referred to, and then the Archbishop proceeds:

"Thus, then, you see how evidently both those places of scripture, and also those ancient fathers, do overthrow that saying of the Admonition, that 'the right of ordering doth at no hand appertain to a Bishop,' and how manifestly also the same have justified that which I have said, that is 'that Bishops *have* authority to admit ministers.'"

"*True it is that I am persuaded that* both *Timothy and Titus, and consequently other Bishops* HAVE AUTHORITY TO ORDAIN and appoint ministers ALONE."—(Ibid, page 435.)

"It is the general consent of all the learned fathers that it pertaineth to the office of a Bishop to order and elect ministers of the word. In this saith Hierome *in Epist. ad Evagrium*, 'a Bishop doth excel all other ministers in that *the ordering* and appointing *of ministers doth* PROPERLY *pertain unto him.*"—(P. 437.)

"The words of Hierome be these: '*Quid enim facit* EXCEPTA ORDINATIONE *Episcopus* quod *presbyter non facit?*' 'What doth a Bishop that a minister doth not *except ordination?*' Whereby he manifestly affirmeth as much as I in this place require, that is, 'that *the right* of *ordering ministers* doth appertain to the Bishop.' The same also Chrysostom in the like words in 1 Timothy iii."—(Page 440.)

When Cartwright argued (precisely as Mr. Goode does), that the Bishop and Pastor were all one, Whitgift replied, quoting Scripture and Fathers, Cyprian, Tertullian, Jerome, etc. to the contrary:

"There *was* superiority among ministers of the word even in the Apostles' time, which I prove by the Scriptures and other testimonies."

"This equality of ministers which you require is both flatly against the Scriptures and all ancient authority of councils and learned men, and the example of all Churches, even from Christ's time."—(Vol. ii., page 401.)

Such, then, are the views of that eminent Prelate upon the alleged parity of Bishops and Presbyters. We learn his judgment of the *monstrous* doctrine of Apostolical Succession from passages like these:

"Where the Apostles could not be present themselves, there they appointed some other to govern the Church for them, as the Apostle Paul did Titus at Creta." "And in that the Apostles * * * gave unto them such authority, it is evident that *therein they made them* SUCCESSORS, which they did not without sufficient warrant and testimony of the Spirit of God."—(Vol. ii., p. 356.)

"Bishops do succeed the Apostles in this function of government." To this purpose he quotes Cyprian, Ambrose, and Zuingle, "old writers and new" (Vol. i., p. 355), and asks:

"Have you any example of any *lawfully* placed in the ministry without the election and admission of the Bishop?"—(Vol. i., p. 440.)

These may suffice to show what his opinions really were upon Succession, and the rights of the Episcopate, and with them we end. More space has been de

voted to the good Primate than we at first designed; but to rescue him from misrepresentation is worth it all and more. And in answering all that our author attempts to prove from him, as to there being no Scriptural warrant for any form of Church government, we answer all of the same kind that he and others allege from Bridges, Cooper, Whittaker, etc.

DR. WILLIAM FULKE (Master of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge) published in 1580 his Confutation of the Romanists, Martial and Stapleton.

Of the value of Apostolical institution he says:

"That there should be particular flocks and Pastors; it is of God's ordination, though God, *by his Apostles*, appointed it to be so. *Yet is it of as absolute necessity* while the Church is dispersed in divers places of the world, as that there is one flock, and one Shepherd over all, Jesus Christ."

As to "parity," etc., he speaks thus:

"He citeth Ambrose to prove that there is a prelacy or preferment in the Church, because he forbiddeth contention thereabout; as though there could not be a prelacy * * of every Bishop over his own church; but there must be one over all the Church."—(P. 258.)

"If the Apostleship had ceased before Bishops had been ordained, Bishoplike power would have ceased with it; but seeing the Apostles ordained Bishops and Elders in every congregation to continue to the world's end, *the Bishop's office hath not ceased*, though the office of the Apostles is expired."—(*Works*, Parker Soc'y Lib., p. 310.)

On Succession he writes thus soundly:

"We doubt not, therefore; but determine with Augustin * * * to rest in the bosom of that Church, which, from the seat of the Apostles, by consent of mankind hath continued by SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS, and hath obtained the height of authority, all heretics barking at it * * * But we utterly deny the popish Church to be this Church which hath had no continuance of succession from the Apostles' seat in faith and doctrine, though it claim never so much the succession of persons and places."

On the same page he speaks of "THE APOSTLES AND THEIR SUCCESSORS, THE BISHOPS."

'Wherefore as the argument of Succession was well used against heretics so long as there was Succession *of doctrine* with Succession *of persons*, so now to allege the only Succession of persons, *where the doctrine is clean changed*, is as foolish and ridiculous as by showing of empty dishes to prove abundance of victuals."—(P. 351.)

BISHOP THOMAS COOPER (of Winchester) published, in 1589, his "Admonition to the Church and people of England to take heed of the contempt of those Bishops and Preachers which God hath sent to them," etc., etc. This reply to the libels of Martin Mar-Prelate, was composed at the desire of the Primate, and sanctioned by him. From it Mr. Goode quotes (page 41) two paragraphs, of the same general character as what we have just disposed of. It would have saved us some trouble if he had printed them as they are in the Bishop's work.

It is somewhat singular, indeed, that the Reverend gentleman's sight should so often fail him, just when he comes to a word or sentence that would interfere with his theory. For instance,

Mr. GOODE quotes:	Bishop COOPER says:
"As for this question of church government, I mean not at this time to stand much on it.	"As for this question of church government, I mean not at this time to stand much on it. *For let them say what they lust, for anything that hath been written hitherto touching it, it is sufficiently answered.*
Only this I desire, that they will lay down out of the word of God some just proofs and a direct commandment that there should be in all ages and states of the Church of Christ one only form of outward government."	Only this I desire, 'that they will lay down out of the word of God some just proofs and a direct commandment that there should be in all ages and states of the Church of Christ one only form of outward government.' Secondly, 'That they will note and name some particular churches, either in the

> Apostles' time or afterward, wherein the whole government of the church was practised only by Doctors, Pastors, Elders, and Deacons, and none other, and THAT *in an equality* without superiority in one above another."

The amiable writer thus warns his readers against the saying that the Bishops, etc., were not the messengers of God:

> "If they be not the ministers and messengers of God, if they be not sent of Him, then it is not the message of God that they have brought us, it is not His word that they have taught us, they be not God's Sacraments that they have delivered unto us, and so do a great number of us remain as no Christians.—(P. 6.)

In answer to the objection that it does great "injury to the Prophets, Apostles, etc., etc., to compare them with such * * * covetous hypocrites, such Antichristian Prelates, such simoniacal preachers as our clergymen now are," he says:

> "I do not compare them (good reader) in worthiness of grace and virtue, but *in likenesse of office and ministry.*"—(P. 3.)

Speaking for the Primate (and himself, of course), he says:

> "He [Whitgift] is likewise persuaded that *there ought to be, by the word of God, a superiority among the ministers of the Church*, which is sufficiently proved in his book against T. C., and in Dr. Bridges' book likewise; and he is at all times ready to justify it by holy Scripture and by the testimony of all antiquity. Epiphanius and Augustinus account them *heretics that hold the contrary.* The arguments to the contrary are vain, their answers absurd, the authorities they use shamefully abused, and the Scriptures wrested."—(P. 34, London edition, 1846.)

DR. JOHN BRIDGES, Dean of Sarum, published, in 1587, his "Defence of the Government established in the Church of England for Ecclesiastical Manners."

As we have not been able to procure a copy of this work, or to find any trustworthy extract of reasonable length, we shall not attempt to give the author's opinions, but simply to show, both from friends and foes, what their character was.

"Dr. Bridges * * had writ against Martin Mar-Prelate's libel, and that very well, but was railed upon for his pains; and the Archbishop underwent the libeller's censure for allowing his book; to which the Archbishop answered, 'That he did peruse Dr. Bridges' said book before it went to the press, and that *he knew that it was the sufficiency thereof* that caused these men to storm as they did, as not being able otherwise to answer it, which made them so bitterly to inveigh against his person.'"—(*Strype's Whitgift*, fol., p. 301.)

Bishop Cooper, as we have just seen, testifies that in his book it was "sufficiently proved" that "there ought to be, by the word of God, a superiority among the ministers of the Church." The Puritan reply to it was entitled, "The Epitome," and had on its title-page, "O read over Dr. John Bridges' book, for it is a worthy work * * * printed over sea in Europe, *within two furlongs of a bouncing Priest.*" This is enough. Our author and his disciples must excuse us if we decline, after this, to believe that the Dean of Sarum held their opinions.*

Dr. Sutcliffe had the honor of writing the first book published in England expressly against that novel system of Presbyterian polity which many were trying to bring in. We believe that there is not a copy of it in this country, and probably very few in existence. We cannot, therefore, quote from

* Dr. Bridges was the first to draw attention to the spurious editions of the Prayer Book got up by the Puritans, and to their other works of the same sort which they modestly proposed as substitutes for the Liturgy of the Church.—(See *Lathbury's History of Convocation*, p. 192.)

it, yet we can give the reader an idea of its purpose. It moved the wrath, not only of the Puritans, but also of Beza (Calvin's successor at Geneva), who wrote to Whitgift, complaining that in it and the work of Saravia he was misrepresented:

"That we would wish all Episcopacy to be abolished; that we would bring back into the Church a democratic *ataxy*, yea an *ochlocracy;* that we would obtrude the Genevan discipline upon all churches, and what not. For these are the contemptible trifles [flosculi] with which we are defamed by Sutcliffe* (after Saravia). His book, entitled 'Queremonia Ecclesiæ' is written, indeed, with sufficient eloquence, but whether with sufficient prudence, I know not."

To this Whitgift replies

"That from that very time almost wherein that discipline which they at Geneva espoused first sprang up * * we here saw no stone by them unturned to render it commended to all the rest of the world for the *only* and *genuine* government of the Church which Christ had instituted, the Apostles observed, and which all the Churches (*if they would set up a solid reformation!*) were bound to restore. For much of that sort was diligently and everywhere inculcated by Calvin, Danæus, Sadeel, Ursin, and set forth by him [Beza] in many *theses* there propounded, in his Annotations also upon the New Testament, in the Book of Confessions, and in his own Epistles."

Having reminded him of Calvin's unjust and uncalled-for attack upon the English Prayer Book,

---

* We invite the reader's attention to the following very remarkable specimen of candor, or accuracy, which he will find on page 38 of "Gallagher's True Churchmanship:"

"Dr. Sutcliffe * * * has also been charged with holding the exclusive view, but WHITGIFT DENIES THAT THIS CHARGE IS JUST." This "vindication" is as follows: "When Dr. Sutcliffe had prepared something in our mother-tongue concerning the Presbytery, that Italian's book (written in Latin, unlearnedly enough, in the midst of England against the English) seemed to him *worthy to be refuted, and withal* to be SOMEWHAT MORE SHARPLY HANDLED, as it deserved. This was the first book among the English in this land set forth, whether in English or Latin, which *undertook a dispute against that Presbytery which flourished among them then abroad.*"

This is a singular denial of the charge of exclusiveness.

which he was not able even to read, the Archbishop goes on to say:

"That again, in the year 1572, when the rashness of our men began to ferment, and they were raised to that hope, that in some books fairly printed they dared as well to shake this Church's form of ecclesiastical government as to obtrude theirs [of Geneva] upon the Assembly of the Three Estates, he [Beza] *studiously commended to a certain honorable councillor of the Queen's to promote that cause.* And further, that the same year he writ to Mr. Knox against the degree of Bishops, *however they professed the Gospel*, that the Bishops brought forth the Papacy * * *that they were relics of Popery.*"

He then went on to give an account of some works published in England, breathing the same spirit, and instanced that virulent book of Travers, "De Disciplina Ecclesiastica," and says, that, though it had been very easy to confute that declaimer, "*they had all* IMPOSED SILENCE *on themselves for* THE PEACE OF THE CHURCH;" and while they were influenced thus by a kind and Christian spirit, Beza's own book appeared, "Of a Threefold Episcopacy," in which he referred to the Order or government of Bishops as "not a human power so much as a *Satanical tyranny!*" He then reminds him that

"The beginnings of that Episcopacy which he [like Mr. Goode] made to be only of human institution is referred by the Fathers with one mouth to the Apostles, as the authors thereof, and that the *Bishops were appointed as* SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES, especially in certain points of their functions. And what Aaron was to his sons and to the Levites, this the Bishops were to the Priests and Deacons."

After all this and more of the same kind, he asks:

"Do you think it fit, grave sir, that we, so often challenged, as it were, to the combat, and by so many books set forth to the disparagement of this Church, *after so great silence*, should answer nothing? that Dr. Saravia should reply nothing, that Dr. Sutcliffe should reply nothing? as though we acknowledged all these things for truths, and of that nature that no sufficient answer could be given to them."—(*Strype's Whitgift*, p. 406, 407.)

This would be the proper place, as regards time, to treat of Roger's Exposition of the Articles, but we defer the examination of it a little longer for reasons that will appear.

HADRIAN SARAVIA, D. D., Prebend of Canterbury, shall be the next to testify. Honest Izaak Walton describes this eminent divine as "German by birth and some time a pastor both in Flanders and Holland, where he had studied and well considered the controverted points concerning Episcopacy and Sacrilege." He wrote a tract in Latin on "The Degrees of the Ministry," to which Beza replied in his work on "A Threefold Episcopacy;" and Saravia in turn published a Confutation. From this, or what he represents as a tract in defence of the former work, Mr. Goode quotes considerably more than a page (38), which he translates from the Latin; but we doubt whether the exact sense of the original is given, if we may judge by one sample of his rendering. The word "Communion" has a well-known special or technical sense, and yet our author turns "offerre *societatem*" into "offer them Communion!" "Society" or "friendly intercourse" would not suit his purpose quite so well!

Yet, after all, the whole extract amounts to no more than a plea for the Continental Protestants on the score of necessity.

"Although I am of opinion that ordinations of ministers of the Church properly belong to Bishops, yet NECESSITY causes that when they are wanting and CAN NOT BE HAD, *orthodox presbyters can in case of necessity ordain a presbyter.*"

We take this as Mr. Goode gives it. It is the strongest sentence in the whole passage, and yet it contains no more than what nine-tenths of all Epis-

copal writers gladly allow, viz.: (to use the words of Archbishop Parker) "Extreme necessity in itself implieth dispensation with all laws." This is the basis of all that Saravia allows even in Mr. Goode's translation, and yet that gentleman says "here again we have a *direct testimony* to the VALIDITY of the ordination of Foreign Reformed Churches!"

The best reply to this is given by Saravia himself in his letter to the ministers of Guernsey.

"I must add one word more which will be hard of digestion * * * being not made ministers of the Church by your Bishop, [they were regarded as within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Winchester, in England] nor by his Dismissories, nor by any other according to the Order of the English Church, *you are not* TRUE *and* LAWFUL MINISTERS."—(*On Different Degrees of Priesthood*, Oxford Edition, 1840, p. 20.)

In his preliminary chapter of the work just named, he tells the Prelates and Pastors of the Anglican Church that "two Archbishops of excellent memory" advised him to write his opinion "concerning the *pre-eminence of Bishops over Presbyters*," and that he had done so in three several treatises.

"How ill they have been received by most ministers of the *so-called Reformed Churches* of Christ, may be seen from the conduct of Beza alone."

He then goes on to speak of what he expects from "some others of the Genevese school:"

"I allude only to those who being puffed up with I know not what fancies of what they think *a purer Reformation*, look with supreme contempt on whosoever differs from them, imagining themselves alone to be wise and reformed: these I know will be most bitterly opposed to me."

He says he is induced to undertake the work, however,

"On account of the great scandals occasioned by the rejection

of Episcopacy and the great advantages thereby given to our adversaries of the Romish Church."—(Pages 2, 3.)

Referring to those Foreign Reformed Churches, whom Mr. Goode quotes him as endorsing, he says:

"To overthrow the whole polity of the primitive Church as it existed in the time next to the Apostles, is not so much to *reform* as to DEFORM." "I would wish them to learn to see wherein they are defective, and cease to glory in *the error of which they ought to be ashamed.*"

To prevent if possible that misconception or misrepresentation from which advocates of a Scriptural Episcopacy have still to suffer, he says:

"The question which I discuss is not one involving salvation, but a question concerning the best guides and masters by whom we may be led in the way to eternal salvation."—(Page 29.)

Lest he should be regarded as a novice or changeling, he says that for twenty-six years past he had over and over again declared his opinion concerning the Episcopate. It was this:

"I consider BISHOPS *indispensably necessary to the Church;* and I hold that form of Church discipline and government to be the best and to be of *divine origin* which is conducted by the hands of holy Bishops and Presbyters truly so called according to the rules of the word of God and of the old Councils."—(Page 32.)

And as to the system of "Foreign Reformed Churches," he says:

"I think the same of this *new method* of governing the Church as others think of the Episcopal form; namely, that *it is of human invention*, and to be *tolerated only where no better is to be had;* and, contrariwise, that which they reject as human, appears to me *divine*, as being appointed by God both in the Old Testament and the New."—(Page 44.)

We are perfectly satisfied with such testimony as this.

RICHARD HOOKER.—Our next witness is one whose right to speak on behalf of the Church will not be

questioned. We refer to that giant of intellectual and moral power whom we never hear mentioned without some title of honor—"the venerable," "the judicious HOOKER." His "Ecclesiastical Polity" is among the very chief of the glories and defences of our Church. It is, like Gibraltar, a rock, a fortress raised far above the common level and proof against every assault. In it there can be found no weakness, no sophistry, no special pleader's trick, no striving after temporary advantage, no anger, no prejudice, no rhetorical arts; but reasoning the most solid set forth with the calmness of a Christian philosopher, and in words, the simple but majestic eloquence of which make it read like an epic poem. Oh! that those who profess to quote Hooker and to treat of his subjects, would study his work and imitate his spirit.

Our author gives two extracts from the "Ecclesiastical Polity," and in a note on page 44, says they furnish "the TRUE testimony of Hooker." For such a remark as this there could be no necessity if some one had not previously offered "false" witness—a thing hinted at by Mr. Goode on page 36. But hints are not sufficient in such a case. We have not the least idea of what the witness that he regards as spurious can have been; and therefore we regret the more that he did not *show* its falseness, and thus bring upon the dishonorable offerer of it the censure he deserved.

It is somewhat remarkable, however, that while censuring his opponents for not giving "*true testimony*," Mr. Goode should prefer to make his selections from that portion of Hooker's great work which *alone* is open to suspicion of not being *truly* his!

The first four Books were published by Hooker

in 1594, and the fifth Book in 1597. No more was printed in his lifetime; and, as Walton says, "whether we have the last three Books as finished by himself, is a just and material question." After the death of the great divine, his friend and patron, Archbishop Whitgift, sent to the unworthy widow to get whatever manuscripts he had left, especially the concluding portion of his great work. She would not give them up nor render any account of them; but subsequently, moved by fear, she confessed that "one Mr. Charke and another minister that dwelt near Canterbury, came and desired that they might go into her husband's study and look upon some of his writings; and that there they two burnt and tore many of them, assuring her that they were writings not fit to be seen." Search was made for the work, or a copy of it, but in vain; and so the next best thing was done. Four years after Hooker's death, a certain Dr. Spencer, to whom Whitgift had entrusted the rough draft or plan of the three missing books, brought them out substantially in the shape in which we have them now. Since then many copies of the sixth, seventh, and eighth books have been extant

"Much disagreeing, being indeed *altered* and diminished as men thought fittest *to make Mr. Hooker's judgment suit with their fancies*, or *give authority to their corrupt designs.*"

Izaak gives evidence of this, and then decides that there are "both omissions and additions in the last three printed books." Yet it is from *one of these* that Mr. Goode proposes to give the *true* opinions of the venerable divine.

We do not reject those books as spurious, but we cannot receive them as wholly and purely the works

of Richard Hooker; nor can we regard them as worthy of the least attention whereinsoever they may differ from those that are undoubtedly his own.

We will now present the reader with extracts not only from *unquestionable* portions of "The Ecclesiastical Polity," but from those very books and chapters to which our author refers, but which he does not quote. First, then, as to things clamored for by the Puritans and stated to have scriptural authority, Hooker says:

"Let necessary collection be made requisite, and we may boldly deny that of all those things which at this day are, with so great necessity, urged upon this Church under the name of reformed church discipline, there is any one which their books hitherto have made manifest to be contained in Scripture. Let them, *if they can*, allege but ONE properly belonging to their cause and not common to them and us, and show the deduction thereof out of Scripture to be necessary."—(Book i., chap. xiv. sect, 2.)

Speaking of that which Whitgift, Cooper, and others have called "government," that is "economia Ecclesiæ," or "discipline," he says:

"Neither can I find that men of soundest judgment have any otherwise taught than that articles of belief and things which all men must of necessity do to the end they may be saved, are either *expressly set down in Scripture* or else *plainly thereby to be gathered*. But touching things which belong to discipline and outward polity, the Church hath authority to make Canons, laws, and decrees, even as we read in the Apostles' times, it did."—(Book iii., chap. x., sect, 7.)

It is of such laws, or the rites etc. which they decree, that Hooker and the others speak when they say that the "government" of a church may be changed. As to the constitution of the Christian ministry, we find no such language. Things indifferent *may* be changed; things divinely instituted

and necessary (even in the second kind of necessity) may not be changed to suit the pleasure of any man or any people.

But let Hooker explain himself. First, then, as to what he means by government or Church polity:

"The matters wherein Church polity is conversant are the *public religious duties* of the Church, as the administration of the word and sacraments, prayer, spiritual censures, and the like." "Laws of polity are laws which appoint *in what manner* THESE shall be performed."—(Book iii., xi., 20.)

But to make and administer such laws there must of necessity be officers:

"Hereupon we hold that God's clergy are a state, which hath been and will be so long as there is a Church upon earth, *necessary* by the plain word of God himself; a state whereunto the rest of God's people must be subject as touching things that pertain to their soul's health."

"Again, forasmuch as where the clergy are any great multitude, order doth require that by degrees they be distinguished, we hold that there ever have been and ever ought to be in such a case at leastwise two sorts of ecclesiastical persons, the one subordinate to the other. As to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always since, we find plainly, both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the word and sacraments have been."—(Ibid.)

Then as to admission to this ministry, he says it cannot be supposed lawful

"That every man that listeth, should take upon him charge in the Church; therefore a solemn admittance is of such necessity that without it there can be no Church polity."

These things, then: (1) worship and discipline, (2) a ministry, (3) degrees in the ministry, (4) ordination thereto, he calls "*principal* and PERPETUAL *parts* in in ecclesiastical polity." Other "particularities," which make for the more convenient being of these, are yet "not of such constant use and *necessity* in God's Church." These minor regulations are such

as we acknowledge have been and may be changed from time to time, and when we read that matters of "government" are left in the power of the Church to vary as it may deem best, *these* are the matters meant.

We have copied these passages, as already stated, from the very Books and Chapters indicated by our author; but now we shall take a wider range.

"The ministry of things divine is a function which as God did himself institute, so neither may men undertake the same but by authority and power given them in lawful manner. * * * Men thereunto assigned do hold their authority from Him, whether they be such as himself immediately, or as the Church in His name investeth."

"Those that have this ministerial power are "a special Order consecrated unto the service of the most high in things wherewith others may not meddle." "The clergy are either Presbyters or Deacons," and "of Presbyters *some were greater*, some less in power, and that *by our Saviour's own appointment*. The greater, they which received *fulness* of spiritual power: the less, they to whom less was granted."

He then speaks of the commissions given to the seventy as Presbyters and the twelve as Apostles.

"To these TWO DEGREES appointed of our Lord and Saviour, Christ, his Apostles soon after added Deacons." "These THREE DEGREES of Ecclesiastical Order have continued in the Church of Christ, the highest and largest that which the Apostles; the next, that which the Presbyters; the lowest, that which the Deacons had."

Here, then, we have a ministry divinely instituted, and that ministry constituted in three Orders.

The ancientest, therefore, of the Fathers mention these THREE degrees of Ecclesiastical Order specified, and no more."

He quotes Tertullian and Optatus to this effect, and proceeds:

"Heaps of allegations in a case so evident and plain are needless. I may securely, therefore, conclude that there are at this day in the Church of England no other than the same

degrees of Ecclesiastical Order — namely, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons — which had their beginning from Christ and his blessed Apostles themselves."—(Book v. passim, or Vol. ii., Oxford Ed., pp. 165, 190.)

Here we might stop and claim that the greatest of our authorities is with us in all that we maintain; but we wish to place this beyond a peradventure, and therefore to learn what is said about the Episcopal Office we turn to the 7th Book, which is devoted to that subject. We are, however, perfectly willing to give up anything found in that book which is at all inconsistent with what has been previously established.

"A thousand five hundred years and upward the Church of Christ hath now continued under the sacred regiment of Bishops."

"A Bishop is a minister of God unto whom, with permanent continuance, there is given *not only* power of administering the word and sacraments, which power other Presbyters have, *but also a further power to* ORDAIN ecclesiastical persons, and a power of chiefty in government over Presbyters as well as laymen, a power to be, by way of jurisdiction, a pastor even to pastors themselves."—(Vol. ii., p. 334.)

"This we boldly, therefore, set down as an infallible truth, that the Church of Christ is at this day lawfully, and so hath been sithence the first beginning, governed by Bishops having permanent superiority and ruling power over other ministers of the word and sacraments."

"The Apostles, therefore, were the first which had such authority, and all others who have it after them in orderly sort, are their lawful successors."—(339.)

"THE APOSTLES *have now their* SUCCESSORS upon earth, their true successors, if not in the largeness, surely in the kind of that Episcopal function whereby they had power to sit as spiritual ordinary judges."

"It was the general received persuasion of the ancient Christian world that 'Ecclesia est in Episcopo'—the outward being of a Church consisteth in the having of a Bishop."

"Again, the power of ordaining both Deacons and Presbyters, the power to give the power of Order unto others, *this* HATH ALWAYS BEEN PECULIAR UNTO BISHOPS. *It hath not been heard of that inferior Presbyters were ever authorized to ordain.*"

"There are some which hold that *between a Bishop and a Presbyter*, touching power of Order, *there is no difference*. The reason of which CONCEIT is for that they see Presbyters, no less than Bishops, authorized to offer up the prayers of the Church, to preach the gospel, to baptize, to administer the Holy Eucharist; but they consider not withal, as they should, that the Presbyters' authority to do these things is derived from the Bishop which doth ordain him thereunto; so that even in those things which are common to both the power of the one is, as it were, a certain light borrowed from the other's lamp."—(Ibid 352.)

Thus Mr. Goode's theory is styled a "conceit," and disproved; but there is much more that bears upon it. Ex. gra.

"The first whom we read to have bent themselves against the superiority of Bishops were Aërius and his followers."

Foiled in his expectation of being made a Bishop, this man through malice began to decry the whole Order.

"His speech was rather furious than convenient for man to use."

"What (saith he) is a Bishop more than a Presbyter? The one doth differ from the other in nothing: for their Order is one, their honor one, one their dignity, etc., etc." "Are we to think Aërius had wrong in being *judged an* HERETIC *for holding this opinion?*"

To this question Hooker intimates that the negative reply would not be wrong, but in charity he prefers the other.

"Let Aërius find the favor to have his sentence so construed: yet his fault in condemning the order of the Church, his not submitting himself unto that order, the schism which he caused in the Church about it, who can excuse?

"His conclusion was that there ought to be no difference between a Presbyter and a Bishop. And of the selfsame mind are the enemies of government by Bishops even at this present day. They hold as Aërieus did * * that between a Presbyter and a Bishop the word of God alloweth not any inequality or difference to be made, etc., etc. Which opinion having now so

many defenders *shall never be able, while the world doth stand, to find in so many of believing antiquity as much as* ONE which hath *given it countenance.*"—(Vol. ii., p. 380.)

In this same book (at page 402) occurs the passage quoted by Mr. Goode, and which we consider different in its general doctrine from all that precedes it; whether it be really from the pen of Hooker or not it is impossible to say. But yet, after all, it is no more than the old plea of necessity.

"Where the Church *must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor* POSSIBLY CAN HAVE a BISHOP to ordain; in case of SUCH NECESSITY the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give place. And therefore we are not simply or without exception to urge *a lineal descent of power from the Apostles* by *continued* SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS in *every* effectual ordination. These cases of INEVITABLE NECESSITY excepted, none may ordain but only Bishops. By the *imposition* of THEIR *hands* it is that the Church giveth power of Order both unto Presbyters and Deacons."

This is all we claim, and requires of us no more than we are perfectly willing to admit.

BISHOP THOMAS BILSON.—Born A. D. 1547, the first year of the Church's freedom. In 1592, while Warden of Winchester College, he wrote the work from which we are about to gather testimony. In 1596 he was consecrated to the See of Worcester. Some idea of the scholarship and eminence of this prelate may be formed from the fact that with Bishop Smith of Gloucester he was appointed to give the final revision to our authorized version of the Bible. He was a prolific author, and some of his works are reprinted still. Although so prominent a divine, he has not been quoted by Mr. Goode; indeed, the only notice taken of him is in the note on page 44, to which reference has already been made.

"The only authorities quoted by the Bishop of Exeter as

holding the doctrine of exclusive validity in the reign of Elizabeth, are Hooker and Bishop Bilson. The *true* testimony of Hooker *is given above*, and it can be shown from *Bilson that this particular question was not before his mind at all.* He says that Bishops only can ordain in the Church of England."

So then Bishop Bilson wrote nothing whatever upon Episcopacy or Apostolical Succession. He discoursed solely of the peculiar privileges of the Order of Bishops [as by State law established] in the English Church! Did the Reverend gentleman ever see Bilson's book? Can it be possible that he ventures to write so positively of a work that he has never examined? or that knowing its character he has so far forgotten himself as to misrepresent it? But how could he venture on such a course? Did he trust to the rarity of the book, or to the hope that *all* his readers would prove to be "exceedingly ill-informed individuals;" or did he suppose it safe to make such a statement in an Essay designed for mere American readers? The very title of the work bears testimony against the statement.* It is "The Perpetual Government of CHRIST'S Church!" and the first sentence of the Editor's preface reads thus: "The work which is now reprinted is a Defence of Episcopacy!!"

But let us hear what the Bishop has to say upon "this particular question" which Mr. Goode declares "was not before his mind at all

---

* "The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church; wherein are handled the fatherly superiority which God first established in the Patriarchs for the guiding of His Church, and after confirmed in the New Testament to THE APOSTLES AND THEIR SUCCESSORS. As also the points in question at this day touching * * * * the distinction of Bishops from Presbyters, and THEIR SUCCESSION *from the Apostles times and hands*, etc., etc."—(*London*, Fol. 1593.)

"Though the Presbyters of each Church had charge of the word and Sacraments even in the Apostles' times, *yet might they not impose hands* nor use the keys without the Apostles, or such as the Apostles, departing or dying, left to be their substitutes and *Successors* in the Churches which they had planted."—(Page 13.)

"Herein who succeeded the Apostles, whether all Presbyters equally or certain chief and chosen men, one in every Church and city trusted with the government both of people and of Presbyters. I have largely debated and *made it* PLAIN, *as well by the Scriptures as by other ancient writers, past all exception*, that from the Apostles to the first Nicene Council, and so along to this our age, there have always been selected some of greater gifts than the residue to *succeed in the Apostles' places*, to whom it belonged both to moderate the Presbyters of each Church and *to take the special charge of imposition of hands;* and this their *singularity in* SUCCEEDING, *and superiority in* ORDAINING, have been observed from the Apostles' times as *the peculiar* and substantial marks of EPISCOPAL power and calling."—(*Ibid.*)

On our author's theory of parity he has also something to say:

"I know some late writers vehemently spurn at this [superiority], and hardly endure *any difference* betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, *unless it be by custom* and consent of men * * * whose opinions, together with the authorities on which they build, I have according to my small skill examined, and *find them no way able to rebate the full and sound evidence* that is for the contrary."—(Pages 13, 14.)

But further to the same purpose, or as regards the persons to whom the right of Ordination belongs, he writes thus:

"The things *proper to* BISHOPS, *which might not be common to Presbyters*, were singularity in succeeding and *superiority in* ORDAINING. These two the Scriptures and Fathers reserve ONLY to BISHOPS; they *never* communicate them unto Presbyters. In every Church and city there might be many Presbyters; there could be but ONE CHIEF to govern the rest: the Presbyters for need *might* impose hands on penitents and infants [as in Confirmation or ordinary blessing]; but *by no means might* THEY *ordain Bishops or ministers of the word and Sacraments.*"

This is surely an odd way of saying that "Bishops only can ordain in the *Church of England!*"

So much upon one of our topics. We offer now a word or two upon the other.

"They can have NO *part of the Apostolical commission that have no show of* APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION." "If they be called by Christ, read their assignation from Christ; if they be not, *surcease that presumption!*"

Quotations to the same effect might easily be multiplied; but these are amply sufficient, and we must hasten on.

ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT.—Born 1544, died 1610. Our author's reference to this Prelate is as follows:

"Of Archbishop Bancroft's opinion we may form some judgment from the countenance he gave to the work of his chaplain, Rogers, on the XXXIX. Articles, already quoted. But indirectly we have a still more express testimony of his judgment on the subject, as well as of several of his brother Bishops, in the following passage in Archbishop Spotiswood's History of Scotland."—(*Goode on Orders*, p. 54.)

We quote this simply to protest against it. We ask the reader to decide whether it is by such indirect methods we are to form our ideas of a man who, for at least twenty years, was among the most prominent divines of his day, and who, during several of those years, was in the chief place of authority in the Church; first while Bishop of London, and then as Archbishop of Canterbury. Did he write nothing for the public? Did he make no mark—did he leave no definite character? Is history wholly silent about him that we are thus referred to the opinion of one of his chaplains, and to a story in Spotiswood?

If a Primate were a man of so little force or individuality that "an opinion of his judgment," upon a matter constantly pressed upon his attention, could only be formed from the fact of his favoring a book written by one of his Clergy, we should not care to

give him much of our attention; but of all the men who have filled the See of Canterbury, Bancroft is probably the last that ought to be so regarded. The Puritan has borne his testimony to this too often and too emphatically to have it all ignored. Church historians have described the man and the part he played, but Mr. Goode, disliking what they set forth, prefers inventing a new character for him, and establishing it by inference!

Fuller says the enemies of Bancroft charged him with cruelty; "He was most stern and stiff to press conformity." Neale (the Puritan advocate) says, he was "a divine of rough temper, a perfect creature of the prerogative, and a declared *enemy* of the civil and religious liberties of the country!" while, in opposition to this, Lawson says, "He was a rigid defender of the Church, a vigilant governor and disciplinarian, learned in controversial theology, an admirable preacher, and a distinguished statesman."—(*Life of Laud*, Vol. i., page 137.) And Lord Clarendon says:.

"He understood the Church excellently, and had *almost rescued it from the hands of the Calvinian party*, and very much subdued the unruly spirit of the nonconformists by and after the Conference at Hampton Court. He countenanced men of the greatest parts in learning, and disposod the Clergy to a more solid course of study than they had been accustomed to, and if he had lived *would quickly have extinguished all that fire which had been kindled at Geneva!*"

These representations of Bancroft's character and opinions are certainly not in harmony with the inference Mr. Goode would like us to draw from his licensing the work of Thomas Rogers.

During the latter half of Elizabeth's reign the op-

position to the Apostolical constitution of the Church gained strength. What was at first a protest against the lordly state or *civil* power of Prelates, or a declaration that there was no Scriptural warrant for the office of *Arch*bishop had come to be a direct assault upon the whole Episcopal Order. At first, as in Cartwright's works, this took the shape of the very argument that Mr. Goode uses, viz., that between Bishops and Priests there is no essential difference, their Order being one and the same. From this the Precisians went on, until Martin Mar-Prelate addressed the chief Pastors of the Church as "Horned masters of the Convocation House—the Conspiration House!" "Enemies of the Gospel; most covetous, wretched, and Popish Priests;" "cursed children of Babylon;" "the Devil's deputies;" a "crew of monstrous and ungodly wretches!"* — (*Strype's Whitgift*, pp. 288, 292.)

Against these, beside the great work of Whitgift, there were several others published, from time to time, calmly and dispassionately setting forth the truth. Two such tracts were published in 1586–7. These milder correctives, however, did not suit men whose minds were made up to extreme measures. Their motto was, "No step backward!" and so they laughed at the gentle remonstrance and fair reasoning of Bishop Cooper and Dr. Bridges.†

---

* The chief writer of the Martin libels was Penry, "a hot-headed Welsh fanatic," disclaimed by the moderate Puritans, but represented as a saintly person by modern eulogists of that party.—(See *Stoughton's Puritan Heroes.*)

† Cooper's Admonition was replied to in a work called "Have you any work for a Cooper?" He himself was reviled as an "impudent, wainscot-faced Bishop!"

They were met then by a man of sterner mould. On the 12th of January, according to Strype (or the 9th of February, according to Lathbury's copy of the original work), Dr. Bancroft, then chaplain to Whitgift, preached at Paul's Cross, before the Parliament, a memorable sermon, which is described as "a furious invective against the Puritans."* Strype's account of it is, that

"He was charged to maintain that the Bishops of England had superiority over their inferior brethren, *jure divino*, and directly from God. For the preaching of this sermon I am apt to believe he had the instructions of the Archbishop to meet with these loud clamors that were now-a-days made against the sacred calling of the English Bishops."

We have elsewhere spoken of Knollys's crafty attempt to show that this doctrine of divine-right Episcopacy impugned the royal authority. He quoted Bancroft as "avouching it [the Episcopal Order] to be of God's own ordinance, though not by express words, yet by necessary consequence;" and further, "that he affirmed their opinion to be *heresy* who impugned that superiority." If the

* This sermon was reprinted in Hicks's Bibliotheca Scriptorum Eccles. Anglic. We have not been able to find a copy.

That in this sermon Bancroft took precisely the same ground that all other Episcopalians take is very evident from many portions of it that are quoted in other works. He makes the same confident appeal to "Holy Scripture and ancient authors" that the Church itself makes in the Preface to the Ordinal, and rejects as untrue whatever is not supported by them. For instance, he condemns the peculiarities of Popery because, "as they are not found in the Scriptures, so are they repugnant, as well to the Fathers as to all the aforesaid general councils." On the same principles the peculiarities of Puritanism must be rejected. Unless the advocates of parity can find some better warrant from Christian antiquity than they have ever as yet been able to produce, they are condemned by those who, in addition to Holy Scripture, refer to the Fathers and the first four general Councils.—(See note in *Lathbury's History of Convocation*, p. 235.)

preacher had held the doctrine of parity, as Mr. Goode insinuates, or if he did not believe the Order of Bishops necessary in the Church, he would surely have repudiated the meaning placed upon his words, but, instead of doing so, he printed his sermon, and when it was attacked he defended it, and from his "Answer" we take these words:

"They may well hold in some superiority, both *jure divino* and *jure humano*. Partly for that in some things, as in superiority of ORDAINING and *consecrating* ministers, and excommunicating, *jus humanum*, and her Majesty's supremacy do approve, maintain, and corroborate, *jus divinum*. To which purpose *jus humanum* doth subservire jure divino, without any abasement at all thereunto."—(*Strype's Whitgift*, fol., p. 293.)

Thus, then, in the very first act of his life which made him an historical personage, Bancroft took decided ground against the doctrine of parity, and any or all of the notions springing from it.

In 1593, he published a work, entitled "Dangerous Positions and Proceedings," and in the year following his "Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline," in both of which the same views were maintained as in his sermon, and the opposers of the peace and order of the Church were ably exposed. Archbishop Whitgift says both works "were liked and greatly commended by the learnedest men in the realm."

In 1603, he was one of the principal parties at the Hampton Court Conference, and it was under his auspices that the Canons of 1604 were passed. These we have already considered. His first act as Archbishop was to enforce conformity. Calderwood, the Presbyterian (to substantiate the charge of cruelty), says three hundred ministers were at that

time deprived; but Collier proves from the Records that there were only forty-nine.*

The Archbishop also united zealously in the plan of King James for bringing the Church of Scotland into conformity with that of England.

With such a history as this to point to, we might pass in silence the unworthy attempt of our author to give to this very decided High Churchman an ultra Low Church character. But we are not willing to leave Mr. Goode a single point of ground to stand on.

First, then, we take up his quotation from Spotiswood. When, in 1610, a regular Episcopate was about to be conferred upon the Church of Scotland, by the consecration of three Scottish clergymen (of whom Spotiswood himself was one) as Bishops of that Church, by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, at the chapel of London House:

"A question in the mean time was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish Bishops, who, as he said, 'must first be ordained Presbyters as having received no ordination from a Bishop.' The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Bancroft, who was by, maintained 'that thereof there was no necessity, seeing, *where* BISHOPS COULD NOT BE HAD, the ordination given by the Presbyters must be esteemed lawful; otherwise, that it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches.' This applauded to by the other Bishops, Ely acquiesced; and at the day and in the place appointed the three Scottish Bishops were consecrated."—(*Goode on Orders*, pp. 55, 56.)

Let this be considered just as it is, and it amounts

* Fuller tells a story which throws considerable light upon the character of the man of whose "cruelty and covetousness" so much has been said. A minister who would not conform went to him and stated that his conscience would not allow him, but if turned out of his living he must beg or starve. The cruel and covetous Prelate at once said he must be deprived, if he would not obey the laws, but he *need neither beg nor starve, for he would maintain him himself!*

to neither more nor less than an acknowledgment that necessity abrogates law. If, where *Bishops could not be had*, Presbyters should in good faith proceed to guard against the perishing of the Church by ordaining others to their own office, many of the most zealous High Churchmen, even though disapproving of their course, would not re-ordain the parties; and so refusal to re-ordain would not at all involve the opinion that the previous act had been lawful and right. But there is another side to this story, as Mr. Goode might well know, seeing that it has been set forth by Collier, Heylin, and others, with whose writings he is familiar. *Ex gra.*

"When on this occasion a difficulty was started by the Bishop of Ely, who was of opinion that the titular Bishops should first be ordained deacons and priests, his objection was overruled by Bancroft, *who maintained that the* EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY *might be conveyed* AT ONCE!"—(*Lives of Eminent Englishmen*, Vol. iii., page 81.)

The principle of this decision, then, really was the old saying *"Presbyter in Episcopo continetur,"* and therefore the Bishop might be ordained *per saltem;* and the case of Ambrose, and others, was sufficient precedent. This, we think, disposes completely of that matter. For the consideration of the other we must pass on to our next authority,

THOMAS ROGERS.—In 1579 this theologian published "The English Creed," which was the first form of the work issued seven years later as an Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles. This Mr. Goode refers to as an "authentic interpretation;" but it is not so, as it never received the Church's sanction. He falls into a much more serious error, however, in describing it as so favorable to Non-Episcopalians that Bancroft's

patronage of it was enough to prove that he did not consider Episcopal ordination necessary!

We have already seen the policy pursued by the Church of England toward the Foreign Reformed Churches. English divines commended and quoted those of the Continent whenever they could, and kept a charitable silence about their defective polity, excusing them on the ground of necessity. On this principle, Rogers, all through his work, refers to those Continental Churches, and shows their agreement with the English, where they do agree. But very different is the course pursued toward those who were separatists and who had no necessity to plead. If he approved of, or would tolerate, Presbyterian ordination, considered on its own merits, he had ample opportunity; for he wrote at the very time when the battle on account of it was raging most fiercely. What then does he say of those who were the advocates of "parity" or "presbytery"—those called "Puritans?" He speaks of the "insolency and boldness of our home faction," who would do no "ecclesiastical duty according to the law; but after their own devisings." He describes them as "headstrong in boldness and schism." Their "denominational churches" he calls "secret conventicles and unlawful assemblies." And those that were deprived for nonconformity he styles "factious spirits and malcontented ministers and preachers" whose "erroneous and schismatical opinions had been brought to light." He says of the parity that they strove "to erect a new (which they term a *true*) ministry and their discipline among us;" and this he styles "the uncouth

doctrine of the factious brethren." He describes them as saying

"A true ministry they shall never have till Archbishops and Bishops be put down and all ministers be made equal * * * *The presbytery* IS THE CHURCH, and every congregation or church *should and* MUST have in it a presbytery."

This he characterizes as "the light which indeed the martyrs never saw!" He rejoices that under Elizabeth their doctrines and proceedings were denounced as "schismatical and seditious."* And he then goes on to speak of an army of valorous champions and challengers,

"Among whom, as your grace was the first in time which gave the onset, so are you to be reckoned with the first and best for zeal, wisdom, and learning." These, he says, "*defended the* PRELACY, stood for the prince and state, profligated the Elders, *set upon the Presbytery, and so battered the new discipline* as hitherto they could never, nor hereafter shall ever fortify and repair the decays thereof."

Such is Thomas Rogers's approval of "Non-Episcopal Churches;" and this is *his description* of the *views and acts of Archbishop Bancroft!*

This, then, is the man to whom our author so confidently refers as holding *his* opinions, and whose having been favored by Bancroft is sufficient to prove that the latter was not a believer in the divine right of Episcopacy, or in Apostolical Succession! We take it for granted the reader will not very readily acknowledge that either the Primate or the Chaplain repudiated the distinctive principles of the Episcopal Church.

---

* These descriptions, and many more of the same kind, are in the Preface to the Edition of 1607, reprinted in Parker Society Library.—(Pages 10, 11, etc.)

But let us turn to Rogers' remarks upon the Articles themselves. From the 23rd he deduces six propositions, which Mr. Goode reprints (on page 14), and follows up by the statement that Rogers says of each, in turn,—it is confessed to by the other Reformed Churches. This is truth, but not the whole truth. It is brought forward to show that the *Church of England holds no opinion upon the subjects we are discussing, different from those professed by Non-Episcopal Churches*, or, at least, that Rogers could discover no difference. Let us examine his own work, then.

The first of his six propositions is "that none may preach publicly but such as thereunto are authorized." With reference to it Mr. Goode quotes the remark, "All this is acknowledged by the Reformed Churches." But Rogers has a little more to say upon the matter. Among the "adversaries to this truth" he names those

"Who publish how the Word is not taught by the sermons of ministers, but only by the revelation of the Spirit; so did Muncer, the Anabaptist, and so doth H. N. and his Family of Love." [Those] "who *run afore they be sent; as do many, both Anabaptists and Puritans;* as Penry, Greenwood, Barrow, etc.; or which hold that they which are able to teach and instruct the people, may and must so do," etc., etc.

The second proposition is that sacraments may not be administered by any but a lawful minister, and under the head of "errors and adversaries to this truth," he classes the opinions and practices of "the Anabaptists," "the Presbyterians at Geneva," and "the disciplinarians or Puritans."

The fifth proposition is that they are lawful ministers who are ordained by men lawfully appointed for that purpose. Under this head he shows that

appointment to the service of God in the ministry may be (1) special and extraordinary as that of prophets and Apostles and (2) ordinary. With reference to the latter he thus teaches the "theory of Succession."

"Some * * * are by man sent; so, in the primitive Church, by the Apostles were pastors and Elders ordained, who, by the same authority, ordained other pastors and teachers, whence it is that the Church as it hath been, so it shall till the end of the world be provided for. * * * The calling of these men is termed a general calling, and it is the ordinary, and in these days, the lawful calling, allowed by the word of God. Contrasted with these are some *who are sent of men not authorized thereunto by the word of God, and that to the disturbance of the power of the Church;* such in the Apostles' time were the false Apostles, in our days be the Anabaptists, Family elders, and law-despising Brownists" [or Congregationalists].

These few sentences give the reader a somewhat better idea of Rogers's "authentic interpretation of this Article" than he would be likely to gather from Mr. Goode's work.

But let us turn to his comment on the still more important 36th article, and there we shall find matter which of course our author did not see, or he would not have classed Thomas Rogers among those who regard Bishops and Presbyters as all one. From that article he deduces two propositions, of which the first reads thus:

"It is agreeable to the word of God, and practice of the primitive Church, that there should be Archbishops, Bishops, and such like differences and inequalities of ecclesiastical ministers."

The defence of this is so pertinent and valuable that we are sorry to omit a single word.

"The proof from God's word." "Albeit the terms and titles of Archbishop we find not, yet the SUPERIORITY which they enjoy, and AUTHORITY which the Bishops and Archbishops do exercise *in* ORDERING *and* CONSECRATING of Bishops and ecclesi-

astical ministers, is grounded upon the word of God; for we find that in the Apostles' days how themselves both were in dignity above the evangelists and the seventy disciples, and for authority both in and over the Church as twelve patriarchs, saith Beza, and also established an ecclesiastical hierarchy. Hence came that Bishop was of Jerusalem, James; of Antioch, Peter; of the Asian Churches, John; of Alexandria, Mark; of Ephesus, yea of all Asia [Minor], Timothy; of all Crete, Titus," etc., etc.

"In the purer times succeeding the Apostles, so approved was the administration of the Church affairs by these kind of men as [that] they ordained Patriarchs, and Chor-Episcopi. They ratified the decrees of Ecclesiastical supremacy at the first and most eminent Council at Nice."

"*They gloried much and greatly* that they had received the Apostles' doctrine *by a succession of Bishops, that they were the successors, in the Apostles' doctrine, of the godly Bishops*, and that Bishops succeeded in the room *of the Apostles.*" *

"Their goodly monuments and worthy labors and books yet extant do shew that Bishop was of Lyons, Irenæus; of Antioch, Ignatius; of Carthage, Cyprian; of Hierusalem, Cyril; of Alexandria, Athanasius," etc., etc.

"Finally, from the Apostles' days hitherto, there never wanted a SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS, neither in the East or Western Churches, albeit there have been from time both *Mar-Prelates* and *Mock-Prelates*, and Ill-Prelates abusing their function and places to the discredit of their calling and profession. *So provident hath the Almighty been for the augmentation of his glory and people by this kind and calling of men.*"

Among the "errors and adversaries unto this truth" he names

"The Anabaptists, who condemn all superiority among men," also four classes of "old heretics," viz.: (1) "the Contobaptites, who allowed of no Bishops; (2) the Acephalians, who would not * * yield obedience unto Bishops; (3) *the Aerians, that equalled Bishops and Priests, making them all one*; (4) the Apostolics, which condemned prelacy." And in addition to these "the late schismatics, namely: (1) the JESUITS, *who cannot brook Episcopal pre-eminence*, and in their high court of reformation have made *a law for the utter abrogation of all Episcopal*

* Rogers's note upon this is an extract from Augustine's comment on 44th Psalm. "Patres missi sunt Apostoli, pro Apostolis filii nati sunt tibi constituti sunt Episcopi hodie enim Episcopi, qui per totum mundum unde nati sunt? Ipsa ecclesia patres illos apellat, ipsa illos genuit, et ipsa illos constituit in sedibus patrum."

jurisdiction; (2) The Disciplinarians or PURITANS among ourselves; for they abhor, and altogether do loathe the callings of Archbishops, Bishops, etc. * * * and say that by the prelatical discipline the liberty of the Church is taken away, and that instead of Archbishops and Bishops *an equality must be made of ministers.*"

Respecting the second proposition from the same article, he says

"That Archbishops, Bishops, and ministers consecrated according to the ordinal, are *rightly, orderly* and *lawfully* ordained or consecrated; because afore their consecration and ordination, they be rightly tried or examined. By imposition of hands [and] needful and seasonable prayers, they be consecrated and ordained, and all this is performed *by those persons, that is by* BISHOPS *to* WHOM *the ordination and consecration of Bishops and ministers was* ALWAYS *principally committed.*"

Among the adversaries unto this truth he counts

"The Family of Love, the PAPISTS, and the PURITANS."

Dr. RICHARD COSIN—This is the last divine of Elizabeth's reign to whom our author refers as favoring his theory of "parity," but he has not brought forward a word of his to that effect. Cosin (on Mr. Goode's own showing—we have not been able to procure his work) was not writing about Church Government as we understand it. He was simply opposing the notion that any one set form of "external policy of *discipline* and *ceremonies* is set down in Scriptures;" and everything he says upon that topic is quite correct, but it has no bearing, whatever, upon our present subject.

Having with Cosin completed his catena of Divines in the Elizabethan period, Mr. Goode writes as follows:

"Such are the statements of some of the best authorities for the doctrine of our Church in the time of Queen Elizabeth, in whose reign our Articles and Formularies were settled (with slight exceptions) in their present form. *And we now challenge the Archbishop's assailants to produce their authorities for the*

same period. Can they bring even one for their doctrine? We do not believe it."

We have accepted the challenge. The reader has now before him abundant material from which to judge (1) whether Mr. Goode's own authorities held the opinions he attributes to them, and (2) whether, beside those whom he has quoted, there were not several others of equal eminence whose voice was too unmistakably against him to allow of their being summoned as witnesses. We would be perfectly willing to leave the whole question here, to add not even one other opinion, if our author had done so; but as he has gone forward, we must follow.

Supposing that by his carefully prepared series of extracts he had already gained a verdict, he says:

"That there was a *declension* from that doctrine afterwards, in many of our divines, *is freely confessed.* But that proves nothing. It can neither alter nor add to the doctrine of our Church as laid down in her Formularies."

The fact, then, is "freely confessed," that since this period the common testimony of our English divines has been wholly opposed to Mr. Goode's theory. The Reverend gentleman, while making this acknowledgment, tries to destroy its value, by representing the decided opinions of modern divines as different from those of their predecessors. He says there was "a declension" from the doctrine of earlier times. This we deny. The reader will find no difference whatever, except in this respect, that the injuries done to the peace of the Church by her Puritan disturbers, prior to their gaining the upper hand, and the unmitigated severity with which she was persecuted by them as soon as they obtained the power, removed from many persons that lingering regard for them,

that hope of conciliating them, which had been entertained before. And therefore the doctrines always held and avowed in the Church were set forth with less reserve or regard for their feelings. *The principles were precisely the same, but the mode of presenting them was a little more positive or forcible.* This is the only change in that direction that the reader will discover.

Mr. Goode, and of course his followers, represent the change they speak of as the work of Laud, and a party that grew up under his influence. It will be remembered that our author says of those "Laudeans," it is *certain* that they "did personally entertain those exclusive views" against which he argues. We believe they did, though not *such* views as he attributes to them. Yet we assert most positively that *those very persons wrote more liberally upon the topics we are discussing than many professed "Low Churchmen."* They wrote quite as charitably as any of those to whom the Reverend gentleman points as proper exponents of Church doctrine. So much so, indeed, that we believe the the extreme High Church partisan of the present day would be very unwilling to adopt all their sentiments. But to proceed.

BISHOP LAUNCELOT ANDREWS.—Inasmuch as this truly great and learned man was the model upon which, so far as he followed any, Laud formed his style and policy, he might be classed among those called "Laudean" divines, as belonging to the same school. He was an able maintainer of Episcopacy by divine right, and is so acknowledged by Mr. Goode.*

* We trust that in giving him credit for making this acknowledgment of a thing which is beyond all denial, we do the Reverend gentleman no

His very strong language upon the grace of ordination and the power of the keys, would certainly not be sanctioned by our author. It belongs decidedly to the school which that gentleman relishes least; it involves principles utterly subversive of the theory we are opposing.

"None is either the holier or the learneder by his ordination. *Yet a grace it is;* for the very office itself is a grace, *mihi data est hæc gratia*, saith the Apostle in more places than one, and speaks of his office and nothing else. The Apostleship was a grace, yet no saving grace. Else should Judas have been saved. Clearly, then, it is the grace of their calling whereby they were sacred and made persons public, and *their acts authentical*, and THEY *enabled to do somewhat about the remission of sins that is not* [*of like avail*] *done by others*, in that THEY have not the like '*mitto vos*,' nor the same '*accipite*,' that these have."—(*Sermons on Whit-Sunday.*)

The doctrine of this passage is more fully carried out in his sermon on Absolution, wherein he shows that the power of forgiving sins is originally in God, and in God alone—in Christ, of course, as God; that the Lord Jesus did out of his commission grant a commission, and thereby associate others with himself to make them fellow-workers with and under him.

"From God, then, it [remission] is derived; from God and to man. Now, if we ask to what men? the text is plain. They to whom Christ said this *remiseritis* were the Apostles."

He then goes on to show that the power was not given to the Apostles personally, and comes to this conclusion:

---

wrong. It is true that he does not make it very candidly. He says (presuming that previous writers had taken his own side), "Bishop Andrews might, *perhaps*, have felt a difficulty with respect to much that our earlier divines had written upon the subject." This, however, is quite an acknowledgment for Mr. Goode. But, besides it, he quotes Andrews' own statement, that our government is of divine right.

"It being then neither personal nor peculiar to them as Apostles, nor again common to all Christians, it must needs be committed to them as Ministers, Priests, or preachers; and consequently to those that in that office and function do succeed them, to whom this commission is still continued. Neither are they that are instituted to that calling ordained or instituted by any other words or verse than this." (John xx. 23.) "Yet not so that absolutely without them God cannot bestow it on whom or when He pleaseth; or that He is bound to this means only, and cannot work without it." * * *

"And if at any time He vouchsafe by others that are not such [ecclesiastical persons], they be in that case *Ministri necessitatis non officii*, in *case of* NECESSITY *Ministers, but* BY OFFICE NOT SO."—(*Appendix*, p. 90.*)

This is sufficiently clear and positive; yet mark how reasonably and charitably the same Prelate could speak of those who are not of us:

"Though our government be by divine right, it follows not either that there is 'no salvation,' or that 'a Church cannot stand without it.' He must needs be stone blind that sees not Churches standing without it; he must needs be made of iron, and hard-hearted, that denies them salvation. We are not made of that metal; we are none of those ironsides; we put a wide difference betwixt them. Somewhat may be wanting that is of divine right (at least in the external government), and yet salvation may be had. . . . . This is not to damn anything, *to prefer a* better *thing before it;* this is not to damn your Church, to recall it to another form, that all antiquity was better pleased with, that is, to ours; and this *when* GOD SHALL GRANT THE OPPORTUNITY, *and your estate may bear it.*"—(*Second Letter to Du Moulin.* See *Wordsw. Christ. Instit.*, Vol. iii., p. 239.)

No man having the least claim to be called an Episcopalian ever wrote more tenderly and judiciously than he has done here, and still the reader will observe that he has not a word of approval for Presbyterian ordination "in the abstract;" he excuses the Foreign Churches purely on the ground of NECESSITY.

---

* Quoted in Tracts for the Times, Amer. ed., Vol. i., pp. 133, 135.

LORD BACON.—This great man is one of those whom Mr. Goode quotes as favoring his doctrine. His first extract reads thus:

"Some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the Churches abroad; and that so far as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers."—(*Advertisement touch. the Controv. of the Church of Eng.*)

We are by no means disposed to grant that Bacon was a good authority. Neither the nature of his mind nor the course of his studies fitted him for such work as explaining disputed points of ecclesiastical polity, or accurately stating details of Church arrangement. He would be much more likely to consider what the arrangement *ought to be* than what it really was, and this tendency is clearly observable in the passage above. He evidently thought it wrong that persons "ordained in foreign parts" should be pronounced "no lawful ministers;" but he did not say that such a decision was contrary to the law of the Church; neither did he say that any and every person "ordained in foreign parts" was properly and legally ordained. He referred to the case of those whose ministerial character had been denied, such as Whittingham, etc., for whom special pleas might be advanced. It is remarkable, too, that the "indiscreet persons" whom he condemns were Whitgift, Bancroft, and others, whose judgment on *such* matters would outweigh his a thousand-fold.

On pages 58–9, Mr. Goode quotes Bacon again, to the effect that God had left ecclesiastical government as free as civil. The passage is indeed a strong one, and yet it means no more than this, that "one form

of *discipline*," and one uniform arrangement of officers, etc., are not "imposed by necessity of a commandment" upon the Church. Lord Bacon says that monarchies and republics are both lawful; but he does *not* say that Presbyterianism is as lawful as Episcopacy. His argument is, that whereinsoever rules are laid down they must be observed, and where there are none, freedom must be allowed.

As to civil government, nothing has been ordered in Scripture respecting its precise form, nothing set forth but "general grounds of justice and manners." This, however (our enemies themselves being judges), is not the case with the subject we are discussing. *The Bible* DOES *teach something about the form of Ecclesiastical government.* On that subject Presbyterians and Churchmen are agreed, and they also agree in the belief that that one which has scriptural sanction ought to be everywhere followed, as far as possible. But we presume that at this day neither one party nor the other will argue that there must be definite warrant for every point of discipline, and every officer in the Church. That was the doctrine of Cartwright and the Puritans of his time. Bacon says:

"In Church matters the *substance of doctrine is immutable*, and *so are the general rules of government;* but for rites and ceremonies, and for the particular hierarchies, policies, and discipline of Churches, they be left at large."—(*Cert. Consid. touching Pacif. of Church.*)

We have no objection to this statement; we endorse every word of it. But the great philosopher has more to say that interests us. If we are invited by Mr. Goode to "hear the impartial testimony of such a mind as his," we ought to take care that the testimony is impartially given.

In the same paragraph from which our author takes the extract above, the reader will find the following:

"In these things, so the general rules be observed, that Christ's flock be fed, *that there be a* SUCCESSION *in* BISHOPS and MINISTERS, which are the prophets of the New Testament, that there be a due and reverent power of the keys, that those that preach the gospel live of the gospel, that all things tend to edification, that *all things be done in order* and with decency, and the like, the rest is left to the holy wisdom and spiritual discretion of the master builders, and inferior builders in Christ's Church, as it is excellently alluded by that Father that noted that Christ's garment was without seam; and yet the Church's garment was of divers colors, and therefore setteth down for a rule *in veste varietas sit, scissura non sit.*"—(Works, Phil. Ed., Vol. ii., page 422.)

The modesty and charity of the Puritans are thus described:

"They have impropriated unto themselves the names of *zealous, sincere,* and *reformed,* as if all others were cold minglers of holy things, and profane, and friends of abuses. Yea, be a man endued with great virtues and fruitful in good works, *yet if he concur not with them,* they term him, in derogation, a *civil* or *moral* man, and compare him to Socrates or some heathen philosopher."—(Page 418.)

"They say the Church of England in King Edward's time, and in the beginning of her majesty's reign, was *but in the cradle,* and the *Bishops in those times did somewhat grope for daybreak,* but that *maturity* and *fulness of light* PROCEEDETH FROM THEMSELVES."—(Ibid.)

As to their progressive demands and changing doctrine, he bears this testimony:

"They first propounded some dislike of certain ceremonies supposed to be superstitious, some complaints of dumb ministers who possess rich benefices, and some invectives against the idle and monastical continuance within the universities by those who had livings to be resident upon, and such like abuses. Thence they went on to condemn the government of Bishops as a hierarchy remaining to us of the corruptions of the Roman Church. * * * And lastly they are come to define of an *only* and *perpetual form of policy* in the Church, which, without con-

sideration of possibility, and foresight of peril and perpetuation of Church and State, MUST *be erected* and planted by the magistrate. Here they stay. Others not able to keep foothold in so steep ground, descend farther."—(Page 417.)

ARCHBISHOP BRAMHALL of Armagh was one of the most learned and energetic writers of the age of James I. and Charles I. Mr. Goode says, that after Andrews, he "took the highest ground among the eminent divines of that day in favor of Episcopacy." This is a well-known fact; yet, notwithstanding he confesses it, our author tries to wring from Bramhall some evidence against the Church's doctrine of Episcopacy and Succession. We give his own quotation; not the whole of it, for we must pay some regard to brevity, but enough to show its purpose fairly:

"And seeing there is required to the essence of a Church — first, a pastor; secondly, a flock; thirdly, a subordination of this flock to this pastor. *Where we are not sure that there is right ordination, what assurance have we that there is a Church?* [But then he immediately adds] *I write not this to prejudge our neighbor Churches.* I dare not limit the extraordinary operation of God's spirit, *where ordinary means are wanting without the default of the persons.* He gave his people manna for food whilst they were in the wilderness. NECESSITY is *a strong plea.* Many Protestant Churches lived under kings and bishops of another communion; others had particular reasons why they could not continue or introduce Bishops; but *it is not so with us.*"

So then, after all, we have here no more than the old plea on which, and on which alone, Churchmen have ever granted that there could be any measure of allowance for the course pursued by the foreign Reformers and their successors. As to the status of the Non-Episcopal bodies on the Continent, he writes thus, as quoted by Mr. Goode:

"I cannot assent to his minor proposition, that either all or any considerable part of the Episcopal divines in England do unchurch either all or the most part of the Protestant

Churches. No man is hurt but by himself. They unchurch none at all, but leave them to stand or fall to their own master." * * * * "If one secluded out of them all those *who want an ordinary succession without their own faults*, out of *invincible ignorance of necessity*; and all *those who desire to have an ordinary succession*, either explicitly or implicitly, they will be reduced to a little flock indeed." * * * "This mistake proceedeth from not distinguishing between the true nature and essence of a Church, *which we do readily grant them*, and the integrity and perfection of a Church, which we cannot grant them without swerving from the judgment of the Catholic Church."—(Quoted in *Goode on Orders*, p. 53.)

This surely is as much of an acknowledgment as any true member of the Church of England ever did or could make. But does it involve the surrender of divine right, Episcopacy, or Apostolical Succession? By no means. On the contrary it takes those doctrines for granted. Is this doubted? Then let us hear the Archbishop again. Speaking of the results that would follow from measures then proposed, he says, in his Fair Warning, part ii.:

"The poor Orthodox Clergy, in the mean time, shall be undone. Their straw shall be taken from them, and the number of their bricks be doubled: *they shall lose the comfortable assurance of an* UNDOUBTED SUCCESSION *by* EPISCOPAL ORDINATION, and put it to a dangerous question *whether they be within the pale of the Church.*"—(*Works*, Vol. iii., p. 280.)

Of the nature and consequence of Puritan policy he speaks thus:

"If it were not for this disciplinarian humor, which will admit no latitude in religion, but makes each nicety a fundamental, and every private opinion an article of faith * * * I doubt not but all Reformed Churches might easily be reconciled."—(*Works*, Vol. iii., 243.)

The reason he assigned for not arguing against those Churches is not that they are complete and Scriptural, that their ministry is valid, and that Succession is of no importance, but simply that their

necessity will justify or excuse their defect, and that we have no right to interfere with them.

"What have I to do with the regulation of Foreign Churches, to burn mine own fingers in snuffing other men's candles? Let them stand or fall to their own masters."

"If the disciplinarians in Scotland could rest contented to dote upon their own inventions, and magnify at home that Diana which themselves have canonized, I should leave them to the best schoolmistress, that is experience, to feel where their shoe wrings them, and to purchase repentance," etc., etc.

On the 86th page of our author's book we find an extract from the Letters of Orders given by Bramhall, when ordaining a Presbyterian minister. On such occasions he used a hypothetical form, and adopted such language as in the following extract, to satisfy the feelings of the candidate:

"Not annihilating your former Orders, IF YOU HAVE ANY, much less condemning *all* the sacred Orders of Foreign Churches, whom we leave to the proper Judge, but only supplying whatever (required by the canons of the English Church) was before deficient," etc., etc.

The Reverend gentleman thinks that this is favorable to his theory. But how so? If Bramhall supposed those held by Presbyterian ministers to have been valid, he could not, without great irregularity and offence against conscience re-ordain them. *They* might have had some idea that their former commission was sufficient, but *his* estimate of it, and *not theirs*, is what concerns us;* and what it was is shown by the emphatic parenthesis (*si quos habuit*), "IF HE HATH ANY!" The Archbishop says also, that by ordaining the parties he did not "annihilate former Orders." True Orders could not be destroyed by any repetition of such services.

* Mr. Goode quotes Leighton's opinion of his own ordination. The opinions of those who performed the act would have been more to the purpose.

ARCHBISHOP USHER was probably the most deeply and variously learned man of his day. If any one was his equal in this respect it was Andrews, who would be well content to rank next to this other great Primate of Ireland.

It is well known that, in 1641, Usher proposed his "Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government," as a means of preventing further contention about Episcopal authority. From this fact many suppose that he was willing to yield up the distinctive principles of his Church; but this was very far from being the case. His "Reduction" consisted in uniting the Presbyters with the Bishops in ordinary Synods for regulating Church matters; it did not differ *essentially* from that which now exists among us of the American Church.

Mr. Goode quotes his "Judgment of Presbyterian Ordination," as given after his death by his friend, Dr. Bernard:

"I have ever declared my opinion to be, that *Episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt non ordine*, and consequently that in places *where Bishops* CANNOT BE HAD *the ordination by Presbyters standeth valid;* yet, on the other side, holding as I do that a Bishop hath superiority in degree above a Presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such Presbyters as have severed themselves from those Bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience, *cannot possibly, by me, be excused from being Schismatical.* And howsoever I must needs think that the Churches which have no Bishops are thereby become *very much defective in their government*, and that *the Churches in France, who, living under a Popish power, cannot do what they would, are more excusable in this defect than the Low Countries, that live under a free State;* yet, for the testifying my communion with these Churches (which I do love and honor as true members of the Church universal), I do profess that, with like affection, I should receive the blessed Sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers, if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers if I were in

Charentone."—(*Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh, etc.*, by N. Bernard; Lond., 1657.

The last sentence of this is frequently cited alone (as, for instance, by the Rev. Dr. J. C. Smith, etc., etc.), which makes it appear as if the Church at Charentone were Episcopal, and that the Bishop said he would as readily commune in a Presbyterian Church as in it; whereas he says no more than that he would as soon partake in one Presbyterian Church as in another! The reader will observe, also, that he does not scruple to regard those as schismatical who sever themselves from Bishops, or pretend to act without them, where they may be had. And this censure has a very wide application.

So much, then, for one of the Lowest Churchmen that either the English or Irish Church ever produced. He says, indeed, that he regards the Bishop and the Presbyter as differing not in Order, but in degree; and this may seem to be all that our author claims. But let us see the explanation of this remark given on the very next page of Bernard's work, and for the express purpose of avoiding any misrepresentation:

"That superiority *only in degree* which he saith a Bishop hath over a Presbyter *is* NOT *to be understood as an arbitrary matter, at the pleasure of men.*" "He held it to be of APOSTOLICAL INSTITUTION, and no more a diminution of the PRE-EMINENCE and AUTHORITY of Episcopacy than the denomination of lights given in common by Moses to all them in the firmament detracts from the sun and moon, whom he calls the greater, and were *assigned of God to have the rule of the rest.*"

Dr. Bernard goes on to show that in this [the old Romish] notion, *Episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non ordine,* Usher had Davenant to agree

with him, "BOTH OF THEM BEING FAR FROM A PARITY!"

At an earlier period he had written a "Tractate upon the Original of Bishops," which, says Bernard, "he hath deduced from the Apostolical times;" and so in his essay, entitled "Ordination a Fundamental," he says:

"That it was a principle of the Catechism taught to Christians at their first reception, that there was to be a SUCCESSIVE ORDINATION or setting apart of persons for the ministry, for an *authoritative* preaching of faith and repentance, and administration of Sacraments."

He also points out

"What a dangerous thing it is—*no less than the hazard of their own salvation*—to lay aside an ordained ministry, or *to deny the doctrine of it.*"—(Pp. 180, 181.)

In the same treatise he argues against the idea that any who are not in the successive ministry can give to others the right to minister, and he quotes the words of our Lord to the Apostles:

"As my Father hath sent, so send I you. Lo I **am with you**, and so WITH YOUR SUCCESSORS, unto the end of the world."

He also meets the argument usually advanced against the doctrine of Succession, that Rome being corrupt she could not give anything worth receiving:

"Is their ordination good? I answer, yes; for it is not a *personal* act, but an act of office; as 'tis not the *learning* of the judge that makes any decree valid, but his *authority* and commission for it."—(Page 217.)

Speaking of the Jewish Priests and Levites who were at times very wicked, and even defiled with idolatry in the days of Ahaz, Manasses and others:

"As bad or worse than the See of Rome; yet, after a reformation, the Succession, which was by their hands, was not questioned. *Though the Priesthood ran through much filth, yet re-*

taining the essentials of the Jewish religion, as circumcision, etc., they were owned of God again in a *successive ministration.*"—(228.)

"In a word, we do affirm that *neither their corruption in opinion nor vitiosity of life* do or did void it to the party ordained. None doubts of the baptism of our forefathers administered * * * in the Church of Rome, *as if there needed any reiteration* by them who survived our reformation; *neither do we renew the Orders received in that Church, when any Priest is converted and betakes himself to our communion*; and why should it be questioned here?"

BISHOP DOWNHAM of Derry in Ireland was another strenuous defender of Episcopacy. He preached in in 1608, at the consecration of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, a sermon in which, of course, he maintained Episcopacy *jure divino.* It was attacked, and Downham published a defence, from which our Author quotes. We regret that we have not been able to get this work, and can only judge of it by its acknowledged character, the extracts we find in the Essay before us, and one or two publications on the same side. It appears, that though affirming the exclusive scriptural warrant of the ministry in three Orders, and government by Bishops, he makes every allowance for those whose circumstances *obliged* them to adopt a different polity. But he has not a word to say in favor of Presbyterian ordination, except in case of such necessity:

"For suppose a Church (the state of some Reformed Churches) either altogether destitute of a Bishop, or pestered with such as the popish prelates are, heretical and idolatrous, by whom no orthodoxal ministers might hope to be ordained, we need not doubt but that the ancient Fathers would, in *such a case of necessity*, have allowed ordination without a Bishop, though *not as regular*, according to the rules of ordinary Church government, yet *as effectual and as justifiable in the want of a Bishop.*" —(*Serm.* pp. 42, 43.)

This opinion is also freely expressed by Bishop

Morton and some others of that day. They grant that "necessity excuseth that which it doth cause." But we find, in such a statement, no very distinct "recognition of the validity of Non-Episcopal ordination."

BISHOP MORTON (1564–1659), "the learned, pious, and painful" Bishop of Durham, was one of the Lowest Churchmen of his day. In his "Profession of Faith," he writes:

"As for our brethren, the Protestants of foreign Reformed Churches, *the most learned and judicious of themselves have bewailed their misery for want of Bishops.* And, THEREFORE, God *forbid that I should be so uncharitable as to censure them for no Churches, for that which is their infelicity, and not their fault.*" *

We find the following extracts from his "Last Will," in the Christian Remembrancer, of November, 1823:

"I do, therefore, here solemnly profess in the presence of Almighty God that, by his grace preventing and assisting me, I have always lived, and purpose to die in the true Catholic faith wherein I was baptized," * * * "As for Councils that are free, and generally consisting of competent persons, lawfully summoned, and proceeding according to the word of God, such as were the four first, viz.: those of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon; I do reverence them as the supreme tribunals of the Church of Christ upon Earth, for judging of heresies, and composing differenees in the Church. *And as I utterly condemn all heresies that have been condemned by any of them, so I heartily wish that all the present differences, in the Church of God, might be determined by a free General Council, as any of those four were.*"

DEAN FIELD (1561–1616) was a man of great erudition, and his Book on the Church is an almost exhaustive treatise. He appears to have fallen into the error of Jerome and the Romanists, as to the

* Quoted in Gallagher's True Churchmanship, page 56.

equality in Order of Bishop and Presbyter; but, like all Episcopalians who have been so misled, he makes the difference in *degree* or *office* marked and essential. He does not venture to say that Presbyters *ought* to ordain, as if they had the right, or that the commission given by them would be valid, but only that they *might* ordain when there appeared *no other way* of preserving the Church of Christ.

Here is part of a long extract given by our author:

"Surely the best learned in the Church of Rome, in former times, durst not pronounce all ordinations of *this* nature to be void. For not only Armachanus, a very learned and worthy Bishop, but, as it appeareth by Alexander of Hales, many learned men in his time, and before, were of opinion that, *in some cases* and *at some times*, Presbyters *may give orders, and that their ordinations are of force;* though to do so, not being urged by EXTREME NECESSITY, cannot be excused from *over-great boldness and presumption.*"—(*Of the Church*, ed. 1628, pp. 155–157.)

This, though quite as strong as any authority to which Mr. Goode can point, is yet simply the same plea of necessity so often referred to.

But let us hear what Field has to say upon the rights of Bishops:

"The best learned men in our age that affect Presbyterial Government ingenously confess it to be an essential and perpetual part of *God's ordinance* for each Presbytery to have a chief among them."—(Vol. iii., p. 212.)

And inasmuch as such a chief or Bishop was by some regarded merely in the light of an exalted Presbyter [*primus inter pares*, as Mr. Goode makes him], he says:

"This *new* conceit we cannot approve of, because we find no pattern of any *such* Bishop or president in all antiquity. But the Fathers describe unto us such a Bishop as hath *eminent* and PEERLESS POWER, without whose consent the *Presbyters can do* NOTHING."

He supports this statement by reference to Ignatius, Cyprian, Tertullian, and Jerome, and then adds:

"So that it is most *clear* and *evident* that the Bishop in each Church is above and before the rest of the Presbyters of the same, *not in Order only, but in degree also, and power of jurisdiction.*"—(*Ibid.*)

"*Bishops alone have the power of ordination*, and no man may *regularly do it without them.* Whereupon, ordinarily and according to the strictness of the old Canons, *all ordinations* made otherwise *are pronounced void;* as we read of one Coluthus *whose ordinations were therefore voided, because he took upon him to ordain, being* NO BISHOP, *but a Presbyter only.*"—(Vol. iv., p. 150, Camb. Eccles. Soc'y ed.)

DR. RICHARD STEWARD, was clerk of the closet to the unfortunate King Charles I., and one of the divines whose opinions had most weight in those troublous times. His "Discourse of Episcopacy and Sacrilege" was written about a year before Laud's murder, in reply to some unfaithful member of the Church who had denied the divine right of Episcopacy.* He refers to Whitgift, Bilson, etc., and quotes Hooker, to show that it was always held in the English Church:

"I may add Bucer, too * * * who, though he was not English born, yet he was a professor here in King Edward's time, and wrote and died in this kingdom. Bishops, saith he, are *ex perpetua Ecclesiarum ordinatione ab ipsis jam Apostolis;* and more, '*visum est* SPIRITUI SANCTO;' and surely, if Bishops be from the Apostles and from the Holy Spirit himself, they are by DIVINE ORDINATION."—(P. 4.)

"We affirm, then, Episcopacy to be of divine right, *i. e.* of divine institution." "Episcopacy was instituted in the Apostles, who were *Bishops, and something more,* and distinguished by Christ himself from the Seventy who were the Presbyters.

* Of this person, who might possibly have a parallel or successor at the present day, Steward says: "This revolted divine would pass for a true son of the Church of England, though he renounces her doctrine and practice." "He lies in his mother's bosom only to betray her, and stays in the vineyard for the same reason the boar does, that he may have the better conveniency of rooting it up."

So the most ancient Fathers generally [do testify.] Or if you will take St. Jerome's opinion (who neither was a Bishop, nor, in his angry mood, any good friend to that Order), they were instituted by the Apostles, who, being *Episcopi et amplius*, did in the latter time formalize and bound out that power which we do still call Episcopacy."—(Pp. 8, 9.)

"Call the Episcopal Order either of divine right or of Apostolical institution, and I shall not quarrel with it; for *Apostolical*, I hope, will seem divine enough to Christians. I am sure Claudius Salmasius (a sharp enemy to the Episcopal Order) thinks so. 'If,' saith he, 'it be from the Apostles, it is of divine right.'"—(P. 9.)

"Thus we find the power of ordination and jurisdiction to be given to those men *alone;* for then that power is properly Episcopal, when *one man alone may execute it.* So St. Paul to Timothy, 'Lay hands,' etc., etc., in the singular number * * * and then the text is plain; he, and he alone, might do it. So to Titus: 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that THOU (and thou *alone*) shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain* Elders in every city;' where plainly these two powers of government and ordination are given to one man."

"This truth appears not only from clear texts, but from the universal consent and practice of more than one thousand five hundred years space of all the Christian Churches. So that *neither St. Jerome nor any other ancient did either hold Orders [to be] lawfully given which were not given by a Bishop*, nor any Church jurisdiction to be lawfully administered which was not either done by their hands, or at least by their deputation."—(P. 10)

Now let us see what this "Laudean" divine has to say in the way of charity:

"Though we do maintain that Episcopacy is of divine right * * * does it then follow that [those in] Germany and the Low Countries are no part of the Catholic Church? I could almost believe that the author of this letter wrote from London indeed, for sure Oxford makes no such arguments. No, it must be a crime of most horrid nature that makes a Church run in *non Ecclesiam.* For though that of the Jews was bad, idolatrically bad, yet God seriously professes He had sent her no bill of divorce. Nay, no learned man of judgment durst ever yet affirm that the Roman Church herself was become no true part of the Church catholic, and yet she breaks a flat precept of Christ's, 'Drink ye all of this.' And shall we be thought to deny the same right unto Christians without Bishops, when they break but Christ's institutions? No. Churches they are—

true parts of the catholic Church—but *in point of ordination and Apostolical government* THEY ARE NOT."—(P. 6.)

That is to say, in one sense they are Churches, in another *not*. If by Church is meant that which has the true constitution, and unquestionable ministerial authority, they do not belong to it; but if no more is meant by that word, than a body of persons professing faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, worshipping the Triune God, they are Churches; which is exactly the distinction we have made.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD (1573–1645) ought, of course, to be the chief of the Laudeans, but we may examine his works in vain for evidence of the heretical opinions and intolerant spirit attributed to him. We should be very unwilling to accept as our own everything he advances, but we see nothing at all to justify the rancor with which he is still pursued. Men who have never read a page of his writings are ready to join in the hue and cry against him as a Papist and a tyrant. With such a spirit we have no sympathy.

In a former chapter, something was said in arrest of such judgment, as regards his supposed tyranny. It is enough to say here, that *he* could have been but little of a Papist, who converted from Romanism and established in the doctrines of the English Church more persons than any one of his day, and who was able to out-reason such a man as Chillingworth, and win him over to the truth. Laud's own "Conference" with Fisher, the Jesuit, and Chillingworth's "Religion of Protestants," have done more injury to Romanism than any ten or twenty works that Non-Episcopal writers have produced since the days of Calvin; and

yet, forsooth, Laud was "*a Papist!*"* But let us hear him speak for himself:

"THE CHURCH may import in our language the *only true Church*, and perhaps, as some of you seem to make it, the root and ground of the Catholic; and this I never did grant of the Roman Church, nor ever mean to do. But *a* Church can imply no more than that it is a member of the whole; and this I never did and never will deny, if it fall not absolutely away from Christ. That it [the Romish] is a *true* Church, I granted also, but not a *right* [Church], as you impose upon me." * * * "A man that is dishonest and unworthy the name, a very thief if you will, is a true man in the verity of his essence * * but he is not therefore a *right* or *upright* man. And a Church that is *exceeding corrupt, both in manners and doctrine*, and SO A DISHONOR *to the name*, is yet a true Church in the verity of essence (as a Church is a company of men which profess the faith of Christ and are baptized into his name), but yet it is not therefore a *right Church* either in doctrine or manners."—"*Conference*" *Works*, Vol. ii., p. 143.)

"You make them 'no Church' (as Bellarmine doth), and so deny them salvation, which cannot be had out of the true Church; but I, for my part, dare not do so." "It ought to be no easy thing to condemn a man of heresy in foundation of faith, much less a Church, least of all so ample and large a Church as the Greek, especially so as to make them no Church. Heaven's gates were not so easily shut against multitudes when St. Peter wore the keys at his own girdle. And it is good counsel which Alphonsus a Castro, one of your own gives, 'Let them consider, that pronounce easily of heresy, how easy it is for themselves to err."—(*Conference*, p. 29.)

"Christ promised the keys to St. Peter (St. Matt., xvi).

---

* Lord Macaulay hated Laud even more than he did Cranmer, but he overshot the mark when he represented him as a shallow-brained creature, whose only power was in a sort of malignant spirit of intolerance. His lordship had probably not read the "Conference," nor heard that the ever-memorable Hales, of Eaton, was worsted in discussion with this weak-minded man, and brought over completely to his opinion. Macaulay himself made few such converts as Chillingworth and Hales.

Dr. J. Cotton Smith has permitted the following unworthy paragraph to appear from his pen:

"A man who, notwithstanding his admitted piety and devotion, could contemplate the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Pope by the Church of England, *who actually hesitated whether he should accept a Cardinal's hat from Rome*, and who was EXECUTED *as a traitor to the liberties of his country*," etc.

True, but so did he to all the rest of the Apostles (St. Matt., xviii., St. John, xx.), and to *their* Successors, as much as to his. * * * * St. Augustine is plain, 'If this were said only of St. Peter, then the Church hath no power to do it,' which God forbid. The Keys, therefore, were given to St. Peter, and the rest in a figure of the Church, to whose power and for whose use they were given. *But there's not one key in that whole, that can let in St. Peter's successor to 'a more powerful principality' universal, than the successors of the other Apostles had.*"

And this is popery!!

BISHOP JOSEPH HALL of Norwich (1574–1656) was one of the noblest men that ever our Church produced, and among the foremost of those who, in his day, could be called "Low Churchmen." He was one of the English divines sent by King James to the Synod of Dort, and from this fact, he is commonly regarded as having been very loose in his attachment to his own Church and its avowed principles. The quotations from his works which we find in publications like those of Mr. Goode, are almost *never* taken from those treatises that he wrote expressly upon the subjects we are now considering. Passages from other portions of his works in which *more suo* he speaks with charity of those who differ from us, are set forward as if they properly represented the position he occupies in relation to the important question before us.

His chief work on the subject is titled "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted." This very name speaks for itself. The principles avowed in the treatise may be inferred from the following extracts taken almost at haphazard. Of Rome he says:

"She is a truly visible Church, but an unsound one." "That which Rome holds in common with us, makes it a Church; that which it obtrudes upon us makes it heretical. The truth of

principle makes it one [with us]; the error and impiety of additions make it irreconcilable."—(Works, Vol. ix., p. 390.)

"That the Latin or Western Church, subject to the Romish tyranny unto the very time of Luther, was a true Church, in which a saving profession of the truth of Christ was found, and *wherein Luther himself received his Christianity*, ORDINATION, *and power of ministry*, our learned Dr. Field hath saved me the labor to prove."—(Ibid 391.)

As regards others, he says:

"We abhor *new Churches* and *new truths!*"

"When Petrus Balma, the last Bishop of Geneva, was by his mutinying citizens frighted and driven out of his place, and that Church was now left headless, Farel and Viret, two zealous preachers, there devised and set up a new platform of Church Government *never before heard of in the Christian world.* Themselves would supply [the place of] the Bishop, and certain burgesses of the city should supply [that of] his assistant clergy, and both of these together would make up the body of an ecclesiastical senate or consistory. *This strange bird, thus hatched* by Farel and Viret, was afterwards brooded by two more famous successors [Calvin and Beza], and all this within the compass of this present age. Now had this form, *being at first devised only out of need for a present shift, contained itself within the compass of Leman Lake, it might have been retained either with the connivance or the* PITY *of the rest of the Christian world*; but, now finding itself to grow in some places through the fame of the abettors into request and good success, *it hath taken the boldness to put itself forth to the notice and approbation of some neighbor Churches.*"—(Vol. x., p. 143.)

Addressing M. G. Grahame, Bishop of Orkney in Scotland, who had renounced his Episcopate, and united himself with the General Assembly of Presbyters, he says:

"To repent you of a most lawful, honorable, holy, divine, vocation, and thereby cast mire in the face of the blessed Apostles, who received it from their God and Saviour, and, [who] by the guidance of his spirit, ordained it, is such an act as can scarce be expiated with floods of overlatest tears."

"Let me advise you, and your now master, *the faction*, not to deceive yourselves vainly with the hope of hiding your heads under the skirts of the authority of those divines, and Churches abroad, which retain that form of government to which you have submitted; for know their case and yours is far enough

different. They *plead to be by a kind of* NECESSITY *cast upon that condition* which you have willingly chosen. They were not, THEY COULD NOT BE what you were, and might still have been."

We may convey some idea of his special treatise on Episcopacy by giving a few of the "grounds," or propositions, maintained in it:

1st. "That government whose foundation is laid by Christ, and whose fabric is raised by the Apostles, is of DIVINE INSTITUTION."

2d. "The practice and recommendation of the Apostles is sufficient warrant for an Apostolical institution."

3d. "The forms ordained for the Church's administration by the Apostles were for UNIVERSAL and PERPETUAL USE."

4th. "The universal practice of the times immediately succeeding the Apostolic times is a sure commentary upon the practice of the Apostles, and our best direction."

12th. "If this which is challenged be the kingdom of Christ, then those Churches which want any essential part of it are *mainly defective.*"

15th. "To depart from the judgment and practice of the universal Church of Christ, ever since the Apostles' time, and betake ourselves to *a new invention*, cannot but be, BESIDES THE DANGER, *vehemently scandalous,*" and '*savour too much of schism.*'"

Such are some of the principal grounds, and we think the reader could from them alone form a fair idea of how the good Bishop regarded Episcopacy and Succession. But his judgment is too important to be left open to question, so we add a few more sentences from his pen:

"It is usually upbraided to us out of our Reverend Whitgift that there may be *some appendances and formalities of government* alterable by the wisdom and discretion of the Church; yet, for the main substance, it is now *utterly indispensible*, and *so must continue* to the *world's end* — indispensible by any voluntary act. What inevitable necessity may do in such a case, we dispute. Necessity hath dispensed with some immediately divine laws; where, then, THAT may be *justly* pleaded we shall not be wanting both in our pity and our prayers."

The good Bishop gives full proof of the assertion,

that even the founders and greatest men of the continental Churches sanctioned Episcopacy. He quotes Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, Molinæus, and others. Among the rest he gives the "judgment" of the learned Dr. Abraham Scultetus, which (being completely in harmony with Hall's own opinion, and in itself so valuable) we cannot help inserting. The question proposed was to this effect, whether Episcopacy be of divine right; whether the Apostles gave to ministers of one class or grade the right to exercise jurisdiction, etc., over the rest? The answer was in the affirmative. It contained the following sentences:

"That Episcopacy had two things *peculiar* to it, *the privilege of succeeding* and the PREROGATIVE *of* ORDAINING; all other things were common to them with the Presbyters." "Episcopacy, therefore, is of *divine right.*"

We offer one more extract from the same work (Section iii., part 2):

"The Apostles were Church governors appointed by Christ to order and settle the affairs of his spiritual kingdom, and therein (beside the preaching of the gospel and baptizing, common to them with other ministers) to ORDAIN A SUCCESSION of the meet administrators of his Church. Thus they were, would be, *must be succeeded, neither could the Church otherwise have subsisted. No Christian can deny this,* ALL *binding upon a* NECESSITY OF APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION *though differing in the quality and degree of their succession.*"

The Bishop then quotes the Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians:

"*Without these* [Bishops, Priests, and Deacons] *there is no elect Church; without these no holy congregation, no assembly of saints.*" [And adds] "Lo! here are words which no Videlius can carp at as interpolated, *imposing such a* NECESSITY *of the being of these* THREE SEVERAL ORDERS in God's Church that *it cannot be right without them.*"

Such were the views of this evangelical Bishop.

BISHOP DAVENANT of Salisbury (born 1572, consecrated, 1621; died, 1641). This able and accomplished divine was also one of those sent by the English king to the Synod of Dort; and as he voluntarily took part in its proceedings and sanctioned its decrees, he will not be suspected of the least sympathy with High Church doctrines. In his series of very valuable "Determinations," we find one (the 42nd) wholly devoted to our present subject. We wish we could afford room for every word of it; but a few paragraphs must suffice.

"Hither tends the argument of the SCHOOLMEN,* that the Episcopate, as distinguished from simple priesthood, is not another Order, but a more eminent power and dignity of certain that are in the same sacerdotal Order." "It is sufficient for us (*laying aside this verbal contention*) to show that those who are called peculiarly 'Bishops' have a *higher dignity, greater power, and more excellent offices annexed* to them than other Presbyters have, and that this is not repugnant to the word of God. *But it were trivial to say* 'not repugnant,' *for it is easy to demonstrate that in the divine word this eminence of Bishops above Presbyters is shadowed out, delineated, and by the Apostles themselves* ESTABLISHED."

"It is evident that Christ himself, for the edification of his Church, constituted ministers, *not* endued with equal authority, but distinct in degree of dignity and power; for the twelve Apostles were superior to the seventy disciples. * * * Moreover, it is the constant doctrine of nearly all the Fathers that the Bishops succeeded the Apostles in the ordinary government, as the Presbyters also succeeded the seventy disciples." Jerome, Ambrose, and Theodoret "all agree in acknowledging Bishops to be the successors of the Apostles."

Having referred to the appointment of James, Timothy, Titus, etc., to their respective charges, he adds:

"It is also *certain* that, throughout the universal Church of Christ, the successors of these also held a certain eminent authority over their own flock, and over inferior ministers; and

* And also of the Puritans and Mr. Goode.

it is equally certain that there was a PERPETUAL SUCCESSION *of the same.*"

He instances as the second mark of Episcopal dignity:

"The right and power of ORDINATION, which was transmitted by the Apostles themselves to BISHOPS, *but denied to inferior Presbyters.*"

"Jerome (whom some suppose to have agreed with Ærius) yet admits that *ordination is so peculiar to Bishops, that it is not lawful for Presbyters to exercise it.* 'What does a Bishop do which a Presbyter does not, *ordination excepted?*' "

"In this Apostolical institution the Catholic Church *always acquiesced, and did not acknowledge any other ordination lawful than that which was solemnized by a lawful* BISHOP. We find a remarkable example of this in the works of Athanasius. One Colythus, a Presbyter in the Church of Alexandria, presumed to ordain other Presbyters. But what was afterward done? *This ordination of his was rescinded,* and all the [*quasi*] Presbyters made by him were *reduced to the rank of laymen.* It is therefore CERTAIN *that the power of* ORDAINING *belongs to* BISHOPS ONLY, *and does not belong to inferior Presbyters.*"

Such, then, is his determination as to the rule; and now for the exception:

"In a *disordered* Church, where ALL *the Bishops are fallen into heresy or idolatry,* where they have refused to ordain orthodox ministers * * * if orthodox Presbyters (for the preservation of the Church) are COMPELLED to ordain other Presbyters, *I could not venture to pronounce* SUCH *ordinations useless and invalid.*"—(See *Works,* edited by Allport, Vol. ii., Determ. 42; also, Vol. i, p. 53 of *Life,* etc.)

This statement of an exceptional case is the *only* part of the whole Determination which our author thinks it prudent to print. But it contains little that will help his cause. It shows what might be done, not ordinarily, but when dire necessity compelled a departure from the Scriptural and proper course; and it does not state that Orders given by Presbyters, even under such circumstances, would be *valid,* but only that he "could not venture to pronounce them

useless and invalid." In this, then, "our learned Bishop Davenant" does not go even as far as some of the so-called Laudean divines, and his not declaring plainly the *lawfulness* and *validity* of such Presbyterian ordination as he describes, we regard as proof positive that the Church had never recognized it as valid or lawful.

BISHOP FRANCIS WHITE, of Ely, is sometimes quoted on the side which our author maintains; and, singularly enough, the following is looked upon as showing that he was not a believer in Apostolical Succession:

"The true visible Church is named Apostolical, not because of local and personal succession of Bishops (only or principally), but because it retaineth the faith and doctrine of the Apostles."*

This is the same Bishop of whom Bastwick testifies that, at his trial,

"He sayd, in the face of the Court, that, if he could not mayntayne his Episcopal authoritie to be *jure divino*, he would fling away his rotchet."

Of course Bastwick reviles him for such a declaration. In his eyes he was only one of those Prelates who are "vermin" or "frogs out of stinking gutters."†

DR. MASON.—We will allow Mr. Goode to introduce this well-known author:

"Another most important witness on this subject is Archdeacon Francis Mason, the eminent defender of the Episcopate of the English Church against the Romanists."‡

The reader will be surprised to hear that, after such a preface, our author does not give a single extract

* Gallagher's True Churchmanship, page 56.
† Trial of Dr. John Bastwick, A. D. 1637.
‡ The Reverend gentleman alludes here to what Bastwick called "Mason's Booke concerning the Succession of Bishops."

from this "most important witness;" but, instead thereof, he prints several passages from *a gross and palpable forgery*. For this vile imposture Mr. Goode pleads thus:

"In 1641, a tract written by him was published, vindicating 'the validity of the ordination of the ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the seas;' being some papers *originally intended* by him to form part of his celebrated Vindication of the Church of England, *but for some reason omitted*. Its publication in this way has *caused some* (especially Mason's translator, Lindsay) *to cast a suspicion upon its genuineness.*"

And the arguments in defence of it which our author advances are (1st), that "his contemporary, Dr. Bernard, Usher's chaplain," speaks of it as his; and (2nd), that Dr. Ward wrote a letter to Archbishop Usher, in which he asked what "specialties" were omitted in Mason's book, and how also Mr. Mason did "warrant the vocation and ordination of the ministers of the Reformed Churches!" And *this*, forsooth, is the proof that *the tract which he quotes was written by Mason!* We need not trouble ourselves about Dr. Ward's queries, as they show that he knew nothing about the "Vindiciæ;" and Dr. Bernard was simply deceived by the impostor who published the work in Mason's name.

Our author takes good care not to give the dates, etc., in full, for even they would have effectually neutralized his special pleading. We will supply what he has omitted:

Mason's Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ was published in 1613. The author died in 1621, *and in* 1641 *a tract was published, said to have been written by him.* Thirteen years after this, Dr. Bernard, who had not been informed of the facts, mentions it as

Mason's, just as, more recently, several eminent literary men were deceived by Chatterton, and talked of the productions of Rowley the monk. Mr. Lindsay, the translator and editor of Mason's work, utterly denounced the cheat, for the following reasons: (1) *It appeared twenty years after the death of the reputed author.* (2) It was set forth by John Duree (the same person mentioned by Mr. Goode on page 56), a *Scotch Presbyterian*, "a man of no consistency, or even of no character," "who would not strain much for such a gnat as imposing a piece of his own upon the world (*to serve the good old cause*), in the name of an author of reputation, who was not alive to do himself justice." (3) It purports to be *an addition* to the original work; but *Dr. Mason never intimated any purpose to make an addition*, and Dr. Brent (his first editor), who was his intimate friend, "Warden of the College where Mason was Fellow," and who had the originals, in the author's own handwriting, "put into his hands for the public benefit," *had never seen this production, nor heard that such a thing was in existence.* (4) That the adventurer Duree "does not tell us how he came by his *pretended addition.* (5) That the principles set forth in it are utterly inconsistent with those in the genuine writings of the Archdeacon. Of this Lindsay gives proof by setting extracts from each source side by side, thus:

DUREE says:	MASON:
"A Presbyter is equal to a Bishop in the power of Order, *and therefore hath equal intrinsic power to give Orders.*"	"Plainly distinguisheth them in this respect * * * he says: "In *preaching the word* and *ministering the sacraments*, every Priest succeedeth the Apostles; and besides these,

	in ORDAINING ministers and exercising the censures of binding and loosing, every Bishop SUCCEEDS the Apostles."
Duree says NECESSITY gives *validity:*	Even this Mason does not seem to have granted, for he
"The ministerial power may be derived from a Presbyter *in case of necessity.*"	"expressly affirms that *no ordination whatever can be valid without one Bishop.*"

After all this, then, we are fully prepared to accept the conclusion passed by Mason's translator, on this wretched imposture:

"*It is none of his, but published * * * to serve the turn of a faction after his death.*"

This is what Mr. Goode describes as "casting a suspicion upon its genuineness!!" With all these facts under his eye, the Reverend gentleman does not hesitate to accept the forgery, and quote it as Mason's work!!* He had a folio volume of about 600 pages before him when he wrote, that contains the unquestionable writings of the eminent Archdeacon; but he does not give five lines of it. He resorts *exclusively* for Mason's opinion to a work that never saw the light until Mason had been twenty years in his grave!

The Reverend Mr. Powell is more frank than his Episcopalian brother. He confesses freely that Mason advocated "the *exclusive* scheme of Episcopacy, *jure*

* Mr. Goode is described by his friends, far in advance of all living writers of controversy, and remarkable for his "CANDOR, IMPARTIALITY, and PROFOUND REGARD FOR THE WHOLE TRUTH." It is well that we are informed of this, else circumstances like those above might seem to "cast a suspicion" upon his character for honesty.

divino," and that he acknowledged the acts of Romish Bishops "merely to keep up the *figment* of Episcopal Ordination and Succession."—(See his Essay, American Edition, p. 17.)

After what has been shown of the real nature of Mason's doctrine, we might omit direct quotations from his works; but it is always best to let a writer speak for himself. His book is written in the form of a dialogue between Orthodox (a Protestant) and Philodox (a Romanist). The former says that Fulke had denounced Romish Orders as Anti-Christian. Orthodox replies:

"We do not detest them *absolutely*, but in so far as they are *yours*. *That which is Christ's we receive;* but that which is yours only, we leave to you. For example: we receive the Order of PRIESTHOOD with all our hearts, so far as it is used in the administration of the Word and Sacraments according to the Word of God; but *so far as it is yours*, that is to say, *ordained to sacrifice*, we do abominate, detest, and reject the same as Anti-Christian. So likewise we pay all due love and honor to DEACONS and BISHOPS," etc., etc., etc.—(*Folio Edition*, 1728, p. 344.)

PHILODOX.—"You esteem the Priesthood of the Roman Church sacrilegious and idolatrous; what then do you make your own, which is derived from it?"

ORTHODOX.—"Pure and holy! For though our ministry be derived from your sacrilegious and idolatrous Bishops, yet it was not derived from them *when* and *as* they were such.* * * What was evil in them was wiped out, and then what was good was derived down to us. *Wherefore we do not receive the followers of Antichrist while they continue such, but then only when they renounce Antichrist* and turn to Christ. But if our forefathers had derived their Orders from such Bishops as had formerly been Popish Priests, *what inconvenience, I pray you, would that be to us?*"—(Page 565.)

"From what has been received, it sufficiently appears that though we receive our calling through Popish channels, it did not come to us muddy, but clear and lawful."—(Page 578.)

"Because I have nothing more at heart than to give to every one of you abundant satisfaction, I think it proper to lay before

you (*as it were a golden chain*) the *successive ordinations* of the most Reverend Father in God, George Lord, Archbishop of Canterbury."—(Page 337.)

"These *alone* are the Ministers of Christ whose ordination is received from Christ Himself, either immediately or by His Apostles."—(Page 344.)

The foot-note to this, in the edition from which we quote, reads thus:

"Then let those look to it, who derive their authority *through any other channel on plea of* NECESSITY!"

To these we add an extract from his sermon on the text, "Let all things be done decently and in order." Addressing those who in that day followed a "higher law," or boasted of more "charitable" feelings than were possessed by their brethren, he says:

"Have you not at your Ordination made a promise, and at your institution taken a reverend oath of Canonical obedience? Wherefore let me exhort *you who have taken this oath, and being admonished by your Bishop,* OPPOSE YOURSELVES *notwithstanding against the laudable discipline of our Church,** to enter into your own souls, and uprightly to consider whether, while you pretend conscience, you do not that which is *uncomely* for conscience? And for our Bishops, oh! what anguish will it be to their souls if those voices which ordained you be constrained to deprive you! And what a comfort would it be, both to them and to all your brethren of the ministry, if we might *join together against the common enemy, and be linked in everlasting chains of love, one with another.*"—(Page 622.)

DR. JOHN GAUDEN.—This divine (afterwards Bishop of Worcester) is supposed to have been the author of the celebrated Eikon Basilike. Of course, he was one of those whom Mr. Goode characterizes

* We beg to assure the reader that this paragraph has not been produced by some modern Duree to suit the case of any parties in New York or elsewhere. It is really from Mason's pen.

as "Laudean." He wrote a work called "Hierapistes — A Defence for the Ministry and Ministers of the Church of England." We have not been able to procure a copy of it, and presume it is no longer extant. There is now before us his essay or letter, called "Analysis—The Loosing of St. Peter's Bands," setting forth the true sense and solution of the Covenant, etc., etc.* This cannot give us his views upon the subject here discussed, except incidentally; but no one who reads the letter can be in any doubt as to the doctrine he held:

"If the Covenant were designed as wilfully exclusive, and totally abjuring of all Episcopal Order, it must needs run us upon a great rock, not only of *novelty*, but of *Schism*, and dash us, both in opinion and practice, against the judgment and custom of the Catholic Church, in all places and ages (till of late years), from the Apostolic days." He speaks of

"A few Reformed Churches of latter days, whose want (*but not contempt*) of Bishops, also *the necessity of the times and distress of affairs* * * * may excuse, while they approve and venerate Episcopacy in others."

"Yet with these we must not so comply as to put a reproach, scandal, scruple, or affront on all other Christian Churches at this day in all the world; among whom not one ever was of old, or is to this day, in any kingdom, to be found without their Bishops as *derived by the Succession of all times, from the Apostles.*

"As for my brethren of the Church of Scotland, I confess that I understand not their motions or mutations, because I think they once enjoyed the best constitutions of Episcopacy in the world. *I have a Christian pity and charity for them.*"—(Quarto, London, 1660.)

BISHOP OVERALL of Norwich.—This distinguished prelate was Prolocutor of the lower house of Convo-

* "It must be owned that he was one of the Assembly of Divines in 1643, and that he took the Covenant; to which, however, he made some scruples and objections, so that his name was soon struck out of the list. He abandoned the cause of the Parliament, as soon as they relinquished their first avowed principles of *reforming* only, instead of *extirpating*, Episcopacy and monarchy."—(*Dowling's Edition of Walton's Lives*, p. xlviii.)

cation when the book of Canons was passed, to which reference was made in a previous chapter. But he was also the *writer of the Book*, and his opinions upon the distinctive principles of the Church may therefore be learned from it. The Canons received formal sanction; but that cannot prevent their being used here to show how, as an individual, the framer of them stood in relation to the question before us.

The whole work is an elaborate justification of the scriptural constitution of our Church. It is not easy to select from it *brief* passages that will give a proper idea of its spirit, or bear separating from the context. But here are a few. He says that we find in scripture

"Two complete degrees of ecclesiastical ministers ordained by Christ himself immediately, viz.: his twelve Apostles and his seventy disciples; the one, in dignity and authority, above the other."

The Apostles were "to provide for a *Succession* in their ministry of fit persons *sufficiently authorized by them* to undertake that charge, as well as to yield some further assistance unto them whilst they themselves lived, as afterwards, also, both to continue the same in their own persons unto their lives' end; and in like manner to ORDAIN by the *authority of the Apostles given unto them, other ministers to succeed themselves.*"—(Convocation Book, pp. 132, 133.)

"In every city and Episcopal See where there were divers priests and minsters of the word and sacraments, and but one Bishop only, the catalogues of the names, *not of their Priests, but of their Bishops*, were very carefully kept from time to time, together with the names of the Apostles or Apostolical persons, the Bishops, their predecessors, from whom they derived their Succession. Of which SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS, *whilst the succession of truth continued with it*, the ancient Fathers made great account and use when any false teachers did broach new doctrine * * * choking them with this, that they were not able to show any Apostolical Church that ever taught as they did."—(Page 148.)

As to the perpetual obligation of Episcopacy, he says:

"Whereupon it followeth of necessity that if the said form of government in the Apostles' days was then necessary for the planting and ordering of Churches, that the same did continue to be *as necessary afterwards.*"—(Page 149.)

And now let us hear what he says of those to whom *exclusively* the power of ordination was committed:

"The primitive Churches, presently after the Apostles' times, finding in the New Testament no one person to have been ordained a Priest or Minister of the Gospel mediately by men, but either by imposition of the Apostles' hands, *or of their hands to whom they gave authority in that behalf*, as unto Timothy and Titus and such other Bishops as they were; and knowing that the Church of Christ should never be left destitute of Priests and Bishops for the work of the ministry, *they durst not presume* upon their own heads *to devise a new form of making ministers*, * * * but held it their bounden duty to leave the same where they found it, viz.: in the hands of Timothy and Titus, and consequently of other Bishops, *their Successors.*" * * "*It was held by them altogether unlawful for any to ordain a Priest or minister of the Word* EXCEPT HE WERE HIMSELF A BISHOP."

"It is true that one Coluthos, being himself but a Priest, would needs take upon him to make Priests * * * and the like attempt was made by one Maximus * * * Howbeit *such ordinations were accounted* VOID *and utterly condemned as* UNLAWFUL; they themselves not escaping such just reproof as so great a novelty and presumption did deserve."—(Page 150.)

BISHOP BULL was one of the most profound theologians the Reformed Church has ever produced. Even those who do not accept his doctrine of justification, bear willing testimony to his great ability and scholarship, and to the holy blamelessness of his life. He was one of the divines persecuted by the Puritans under Cromwell. His controversial works against Roman error are unanswerable. We need not give many extracts to show what *his* views were on the topics we are considering:

"We proceed in the next place to the constant visibility and Succession of pastors in our Church. * * * * Our records faith-

fully kept and preserved, do evidence to all the world an UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS in our Church, canonically ordained, derived from such persons in whom a lawful power of ordination was seated by the confession of the papists themselves."—(*Vindication of the English Church*, Sect. 24.)

BISHOP COSIN (1594–1672).*—In the case of this eminent theologian we find another instance of that willingness to use *questionable* evidence, or that preference for what is indirect and liable to objection, which we have found manifested by Mr. Goode in his treatment of Hooker, Bancroft, and Mason.

The acknowledged works of Bishop Cosin have been before the public for over two hundred years, and are well known to-day. It is not a little remarkable, then, that our author should allow them to pass unnoticed, and should make his quotations from a letter said to have been written by Cosin to some M. Cordel.

This letter was first printed in Basire's account of the Bishop, *published after his death.* We do not *deny* its genuineness, but we have never seen it established. In any case, however, it is wrong to resort to such sources of evidence while there are extant unquestionable writings of the same author from which his opinions can be ascertained.†

Waiving further question as to the authority of

---

* Dr. J. C. Smith quotes this divine as Dean Cosin. We cannot help being surprised at this from the editor of the Church Monthly. Cosin was, indeed, a Dean at one time, so was Laud. It is not usual, however, to style the latter Dean Laud. Dr. Smith evidently confounds the Bishop with Dean Richard Cosin, who wrote nearly seventy years before.—(See p. 338.)

† The editor of the last edition of Cosin's works has admitted this letter among them, not because it has been proved *genuine* and *uninterpolated*, but because another communication, which we quote, shows that some such letter had been written.

this document, we proceed to examine it. Mr. Goode begins his extract with this paragraph:

"Though we may safely say and maintain it, that *their ministers* are *not so duly and rightly ordained as they should be by those Prelates and Bishops of the Church who, since the Apostles' time, have only had the ordinary power and authority to make and constitute a Priest*, yet that, by reason of this defect, there is a *total nullity* in their ordination, or that they be therefore no Priests or ministers of the Church at all, because they are ordained by those only who are no more but Priests among them. *For my part I would be loath to affirm and determine it against them.*"

If the Church had always recognized the validity of Presbyterian ordination, as Mr. Goode maintains, the writer of this letter need not have scrupled to affirm it; but it will be observed that he does nothing of the kind. He only expressed his unwillingness to pronounce that ordination wholly *null* and *void*. He speaks of persons commissioned by Presbyters, as "not so duly and rightly ordained" as the Episcopal clergy were; thus introducing the singular idea of there being *degrees of lawfulness* in such matters. Either a man has a true and sufficient authority to minister in holy things, or he has none; a sliding scale cannot well be used in measuring the divine commission.

The writer proceeds to assign his reasons for acknowledging a possible validity in Presbyterian Orders. Thus, the power of ordination was confined to Bishops by Apostolical practice and the customs and canons of the Church;* from which custom and laws of the Universal Church, he reckons it *a great presumption and fault* to depart; yet when parties

* But not, as the writer supposes, "by any absolute precept that either Christ or His Apostles gave about it."

have so departed, and done that which *ought not* to be done [fieri non oportuit], he could not peremptorily say *factum non valet*—the ordination is utterly void:

"For as in the case of baptism, we take just exception against a layman or a woman that presumes to give it, and may as justly punish them by the censures of the Church wherein they live, for *taking upon them to do that office*, WHICH WAS NEVER COMMITTED UNTO THEM; yet, *if once they have done it*, we make not their act and administration of baptism void; nor *presume we to iterate the sacrament after them; so may it well be in the case of ordination and the ministers of the Reformed Congregations in France*, who are liable to give an account both to God and His Church in general, for *taking upon them to exercise that power which by the perpetual practice and laws of His Church, they were never permitted to exercise.*"

Such, then, are the grounds upon which the writer of the letter to Cordel basis his unwillingness to affirm the nullity of Non-Episcopal ordination. Presbyters have no more right to ordain, than laymen or women have to baptize; yet if they do it, we ought not to say that *nothing* has been done! If Mr. Goode's Non-Episcopal friends are satisfied with such a view of the case, they are welcome to it.

But touching such "inorderly ordination," the writer says:

"Their boldness, presumption, and novelty, in setting up themselves (without any *invincible* necessity that they had so to do) against the *Apostolical practice and perpetual order of God's Church* [till their days], was always faulted and reserved for further censure in due time, which they have justly merited."

He refers to the views of parity in Order, propounded, as was supposed, by Jerome, and certainly by many Romanists, among whom he mentions the Schoolmen: Armachanus (Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh), Alphonsus a Castro, and Michael Medina;

and certain Continental and English Protestant divines, whom he supposes to have agreed with them, and then says:

"All which authors are of so great credit with you and me, that *though we are not altogether of their mind*, yet we would be loath to let the world see that we contradict them all and condemn their judgment openly; as needs we must if we hold the contrary and say that the ministers of the Reformed French Churches, for want of Episcopal Ordination, have no Order at all."

So then the writer of the letter to Cordel did not agree with those who believed in parity; he was only unwilling to contradict them. He would acknowledge a *possible* validity rather than to appear to condemn a judgment which yet he did not approve.

But let us now attend to what Bishop Cosin did certainly write. It appears that copies of the letter just referred to were in circulation, and a friend wrote to inquire about it. To him Cosin replied:

"What paper that is which is read and talked of among you as mine, concerning the French Ordinations, I know not; but some discourse I made upon that subject and their Church and Sacraments here, about seven years since. If a perfect copy of my writing (which is long) be among you, I fear not the censure of any moderate and learned man whatsoever; and if the Presbyterians think to get any advantage by it, they will much deceive themselves.

"You shall not find (*if the copy of the letter be true and entire*) that I ever said Presbyters had any power of rightful ordination in the judgment of antiquity; nay, *you shall find the contrary*, and that I greatly blame them, saying, that *they will never be able to answer it for presuming to take a power upon them which was never given nor committed unto them;* and that *nothing but a case of* NECESSITY reserving *their wonted desire of Bishops* where they are by no means to be had or permitted, can excuse them.

"I know it is *the interest of the Pope and of the Jesuits*, with others of the like faction, to cry down the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy; and as I never was so, by the grace of God, I never shall be of that faction.

"But the question only is, whether there be such an absolute necessity and precept in that *jus divinum*, in all places and at all times, as [that] *where it* CANNOT *be put in practice*, there, *in such case of* NECESSITY, the ordination of a Presbyter by a College of Presbyters (though altogether against the ancient and Apostolical Canons, for which they are to answer), shall be *utterly void and invalid* to all effects whatsoever."—(*Works*, Vol. iv., p. 421.)

Speaking of another divine "who was as great a patron of antiquity and the Church of England as any Bishop or Priest that ever lived in it," he quotes him as follows:

"Though we are not to lessen the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy where it is established and may be had, yet we must take heed that we do not, for want of Episcopacy *where it* CANNOT *be had*, cry down and destroy all the Reformed Churches abroad, both in Germany, France, and other places, and say they have neither ministers nor sacraments, but all is null and void they do.

"THIS *is all the letter drives at, and nothing else*, which truly I cannot apprehend how it either hurts the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy, or *excuseth their voluntary and transcendent impiety*, that have endeavored to destroy it in the Church of England."

In his controversy with Father Robinson, when the latter objected that the English Church had only ordination imperfect, both in matter and form, Cosin replied saying that it "had retained all things necessary to ordination," including, of course, "a lawful succession." And as to the matter and form referred to by Robinson, he shows that they were not used by the Greek Church nor the Armenian:

"Whose orders were acknowledged as valid *because they had all things necessary to full ordination.*"

It would have served his purpose still better to have pointed to the Reformed Non-Episcopal Churches which totally rejected the ceremonies in question; but he did not name them, simply because he could not defend the validity of their Orders.

In the same work he enumerates among the doctrines and practices of the Church of England:

"The consecrations of Bishops and the ordaining of Priests and Deacons for the service of God, in His Church, *by a* LAWFUL SUCCESSION."—(*Works*, Vol. iv., p. 336.)

In his letter to Dr. Watson, A.D. 1657, he says expressly:

"They of Geneva are to blame in many things, and defective in some. *They shall* NEVER *have my approbation of their doings, nor let them have yours.*"

His "Last Will" [A.D. 1672], contains the following paragraph:

"The heresies and schisms, I say, of all these, I also as most addicted to the symbols and confessions of the Church of England (or rather the Catholic Church), do constantly renounce, condemn, and reject. Among whom I rank not only the Separatists, the Anabaptists and their followers (alas! too many), but also *new Independents and Presbyterians of our own country.*"

Mr. Goode has referred to the Bishop's Will, but he did not venture to lay before his readers *this* "recognition of Non-Episcopal Churches."

During the supremacy of the Presbyterian party, they published a work called *Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani*, in which they claimed exclusive scriptural warrant for their own irregular and defective ministry. This work met with bitter opposition from the Congregationalists; and it was also replied to by several Episcopal writers, among whom, probably, the greatest in erudition, as well as one of the very first in ability, was

Dr. HENRY HAMMOND. This divine was born in 1605, and educated at Eton and Oxford. He was one of King Charles' Chaplains. As a matter of course, he was deprived under the Puritan government, and

suffered greatly. At the Restoration he was designed for the Bishopric of Worcester, but died before consecration, April 25, 1660. His works have been often re-printed, and for variety of learning and full treatment of their subjects, they remain still unsurpassed.

His decision as to the parties who, in the authority to ordain and to govern the Church, succeed the Apostles, is as follows:

"I answer that it being a matter of fact or story later than that the Scriptures can universally reach to, it cannot be *fully* satisfied or answered from thence, but will, in the full latitude through the universal Church in these times, be made clear from the recent evidences we have, viz.: from the consent of the Greek and Latin Fathers, who generally resolve that BISHOPS *were those* SUCCESSORS."—(*On the Keys*, preface.)

In his "Practical Catechism," he thus defines the term "Holy Catholic Church:"

"This Church is a society of believers, ruled and continued according to those ordinances, with the use of the Sacraments, preaching of the word, censures, etc., *under* BISHOPS, or pastors, *succeeding those on whom the Holy Ghost came down*, and (by receiving ordination of those that had that power before them, *i. e., of the* BISHOPS *of the Church, the continued* SUCCESSORS *of the Apostles*), lawfully called to those offices."

WILLIAM CHILLINGWORTH (1602–1644). The unequalled defender of Protestantism concludes thus his Demonstration of the Apostolical institution of Episcopacy:

"Episcopal Government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church presently after the Apostles' times. Between the Apostles' times and this 'presently after,' there was not time enough for, nor possibility of so great an alteration, and therefore there was no such alteration as is pretended [by Presbyterians]; and therefore Episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be Apostolic, 'quod erat demonstrandum.'"

BISHOP JEREMY TAYLOR (died 1667). Our next authority shall be the English Chrysostom. He was one of those whose merit was discovered by Laud, who made him his Chaplain. He was also Chaplain in ordinary to Charles I. After the Church and State were overthrown, being deprived of his living, he retired to Wales, and there in privacy exercised his ministry, and taught a school for his support. He was twice imprisoned by the Puritan government; but at the Restoration his faithfulness was rewarded. He was advanced to the Episcopate, being made Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore. From his glorious pen have come some of the most powerful defences of the Church that it has ever had, and to him belongs what many will regard as the still higher glory of having written the first and best argument for Toleration that ever appeared; we refer to the "Liberty of Prophesying." There can be no doubt as to the side on which he stands in the present discussion. Probably a fair idea of his opinions may be gathered from this *just* and *charitable* reference to him in Powell's Essay on Apostolical Succession:

"The reader may be surprised to find the celebrated Bishop Taylor represented as a SEMI-PAPIST; let him read his 'Clerus Domini' and his 'Episcopacy Asserted,' and he will see the evidence of the statement. Bishop Taylor's splendid talents have imposed on many, and have gained him more credit than he deserved. Like many pious PAPISTS, he could write well upon devotional subjects."

But hearken to what is said on the other side by an "Evangelical" Clergyman writing against Tractarianism:

"Taylor, I need hardly say, is one of these sound divines of the 17th century, as they have been called, who have been sup-

posed, *but* MOST ERRONEOUSLY SUPPOSED, to lend their sanction to the Tractarian opinions. Could I but hope to influence any of the Tractarians by the authority of *this great divine* * * * how happy should I be."—(*Bird's Defence of the Reformation*, p. 40.)

But now let us attend to the Bishop himself. His "Episcopacy Asserted" begins with chapters or sections on the following propositions:

(1.) "Christ did institute a government in his Church." (2.) "This government was first committed to the Apostles by Christ." (3.) "With the power of joining others, and appointing successors in the Apostolate." (4.) "The SUCCESSION into the ordinary office of the Apostolate is made by BISHOPS."

The opening sentence of the 4th section reads thus:

"For although Deacons and Priests have part of these, and therefore, though in a very limited sense, may be called *Successores Apostolorum*, to wit: in the power of baptizing, consecrating the Eucharist, and preaching * * * yet the Apostolate and Episcopacy, which did communicate in all the power and offices which are ordinary and perpetual, are in Scripture clearly all one in ordinary ministrations, and their names are often used in common to signify exactly the same ordinary function." (Amer. Ed. 1844, p. 36–7.)

The Bishop then proceeds to show, in other sections, that Christ himself made the Episcopal or Apostolic Office distinct from that of the Presbyters, attaching to it certain powers which were not given to the other:

"Therefore this office and ministry of the Apostolate is distinct from and superior to that of Presbyters, and *this distinction must be so continued to all ages of the Church; for the thing was not temporary*, but productive of issue and *succession*, and therefore as perpetual as the clergy, as the Church itself." —(Page 45.)

And as to the ordaining power, he says (P. 144):

"Bishops had a power of imposing hands for collating of Orders which Presbyters have not. What was done in this affair in the times of the Apostles, I have already explicated; but now the inquiry is what *the Church* did in pursuance of the practice and the tradition Apostolical. The first and second

Canons of the Apostles command that two or three Bishops should ordain a Bishop, and one Bishop should ordain a Priest and a Deacon. A PRESBYTER IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO ORDAIN—A BISHOP IS.

"To say that Bishops are not a distinct Order from Presbyters, was a heresy first broached by Ærius, and hath lately been * * countenanced by many of the Church of Rome."—(*Ibid.*)

And as to schism, we have this very decided testimony:

"No separation from a Bishop, as such, can be lawful; and yet, if there were a thousand cases in which it were lawful to separate *from a Bishop*, yet *in no case is it lawful to separate from Episcopacy;* that is *the quintessence and spirit of Schism, a direct overthrow to Christianity, and a confronting of a divine institution.*"—(Page 246.)

BISHOP ROBERT SANDERSON.—This illustrious theologian and casuist was born in 1587, and educated at Oxford. The following passage from Izaak Walton's charming sketch of his life will be a good introduction to what we shall quote from his works:

"In this contented obscurity he continued, until the learned and good Archbishop Laud, who knew him well at Oxford, for he was his contemporary there, told the King * * * that there was one Mr. Sanderson, an obscure country minister, that was of such sincerity, and so excellent in all casuistical learning, that he desired his majesty would make him his Chaplain. The King granted it most willingly, and gave the Bishop charge to hasten it; for he longed to discourse with a man that had dedicated his studies to that useful part of learning." * * * Sanderson was made his chaplain in ordinary in November following, A. D. 1631. "The good King was never absent from his sermons, and would usually say, 'I carry my ears to hear other preachers, but I carry my conscience to hear Mr. Sanderson, and to act accordingly.' Soon after this he was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, where," says Walton, "he did, for about a year's time, continue to read his matchless lectures, which were at first *de Juramento*, a point very difficult, and at that time very dangerous to be handled as it ought to be.* How much the learned world stands obliged to him for these and for his following lectures, *de Conscientia*, I shall not attempt to

declare, being very sensible that the best pens must needs fall far short in the commendation of them."

When the Puritan party was in the ascendant, the the King being prisoner in the Isle of Wight,

"The Parliament sent the Covenant, the Negative Oath, and I know not what more, to be taken by the Doctor of the Chair and all Heads of Houses: and all other inferior scholars, of what degree soever, were to take these oaths by a fixed day; and those that did not, *to abandon their College, and the University too, within twenty-four hours after the beating of a drum;* for if they remained longer they were to be treated as spies."

The University then came to a decision, and appointed certain delegates to draw up a remonstrance. Among these was Dr. Sheldon (afterwards Archbishop), Dr. Morley (afterwards Bishop of Winchester), Dr. Zouch, the eminent jurist, Dr. Hammond, and Dr. Sanderson. They refused to consent to the abolition of Episcopacy, for the following reasons:

"Videtur nobis esse regimen Episcopale si non juris divini sensu strictiore at Apostolicæ saltem institutionis, hoc est etiamsi nullibi a Deo explicate preceptum, ab Apostolis tamen in ecclesiis institutum ad mentem et exemplum preceptoris sui Jesu Christi."

This was written by Sanderson, who, with the rest,

"Was, in June, 1648, forced to pack up and be gone, and thank God he was not imprisoned, as Dr. Sheldon and Dr. Hammond and others then were."

For twelve years after this, he was deprived of all income as a minister, and often reduced to great distress; but at the Restoration he was made Bishop of Lincoln. He was moderator at the Savoy Conference, in 1662, and the chief author or moulder of the changes then made in the Liturgy. The admirable preface beginning "It hath been the wisdom of the Church," etc., and also the "Prayer for all conditions of men," were drawn up by him.

This brief sketch is sufficient to show that the good Bishop was a thorough Episcopalian, willing to suffer rather than yield up the distinctive principles of his Church. But we are proceeding on the principle that every man, as far as possible, should be allowed to speak for himself; therefore we give the following:

"My opinion is that Episcopal government is not to be derived merely from Apostolical practice or institution, but that it is originally founded in the person and office of the Messias, our blessed Lord, JESUS CHRIST, who, being sent by our heavenly Father to be Great Apostle, Bishop and Pastor of the Church * * did afterwards, before his ascension into heaven, send and empower His Holy Spirit, in like manner as His Father had before sent Him to execute the same Apostolical, Episcopal, and Pastoral office, for the Ordering and governing of his Church until his coming again; *and so the same office to continue in them and their successors unto the end of the world.*"—(*Divine Right of Episcopacy.*)

Mr. Goode quote's Sanderson's exposition of Divine Right, and tries to turn it to his own use (see his Appendix D, page 92).* The Bishop says the term has two significations: (1) "A clear, express, and peremptory COMMAND of God in his word," that the thing so enjoined "should be perpetually and universally observed." Very few things possess divine right in this stricter sense. He considers that it belongs *only* to the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. (2) "Authority and warrant from the institution, example, and approbation either of Christ himself or his Apostles;" the thing possessing this warrant being "held, by the consentient judgment of all the Churches of

* We cannot spare room for the entire passage. The reader will please turn to Mr. Goode's Essay, and observe whether we represent him fairly.

Christ in the primitive and succeeding ages, needful to be continued:"

"Of which sort I take the observation of the Lord's day, the ordering of the keys, the distinction of Presbyters and Deacons, and some other things (not all perhaps of equal consequence) to be. Unto *jus divinum*, in that former acceptation, is required a divine precept; in this latter, it sufficeth thereunto that a thing be of Apostolical institution or practice."

Having drawn this distinction, he determines as follows, regarding its application to Episcopacy:

"Now that the government of the Churches of Christ by Bishops is of divine right, in that first and stricter sense, is an opinion at least, of great probability, and such as may more easily, and upon better grounds, be defended than confuted. . . . Yet, because it is both inexpedient to maintain a dispute where it needs not, and *needless to contend for more, where less will serve the turn*, I find that our divines that have travailed most in this argument, where they purposely treat of it, do rather choose to stand to the tenure of Episcopacy *ex Apostolica designatione*, than to hold a contest upon the title of *jus divinum*, no necessity requiring the same to be done. * * * Sufficient it is for the justification of the Church of England in the constitution and government thereof, that *it is (as certainly it is) of* DIVINE RIGHT *in the latter and larger signification:* that is to say, of Apostolical institution and approbation; *exercised by the Apostles themselves*, and by other persons in their times, appointed and enabled thereunto by them, *according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and by virtue of the commission they had received from him."

We have given this extract, chiefly for the purpose of appending to it Mr. Goode's most uncandid comment:

"So that all he ventures to say in favor of Episcopacy being *jure divino* in the strict sense of the phrase—which alone would make it of absolute necessity—is that it appears to him to be 'an *opinion* at least of great PROBABILITY;' and he admits that our divines for the most part only contend for the *Apostolical* institution of Episcopacy."

We have seldom seen a more deliberate attempt to make an author oppose himself. Sanderson says

there are two kinds of divine right—(1) that arising from an express command; (2) that arising from the institution or example of Christ or His Apostles. But *jus divinum*, no matter how derived, makes a thing obligatory. Mr. Goode, with amazing coolness, says *it does not: the command alone can do so;* and this is so said *that it might seem to be Sanderson's own view of the matter*, whereas he has stated plainly, that things having the divine right, in the second sense, possess both "AUTHORITY and WARRANT," and by the judgment of the Church, have been esteemed "needful to be continued!" The Bishop calls his first sense of *jus divinum* the "*stricter* one." Mr. Goode tries, by a very slight change in the word, to make a great one in sense. He calls it the "STRICT sense," thus insinuating that to the other the title of divine right cannot be *strictly* applied!

The object being to show that Episcopacy has Scriptural authority, Sanderson says that most English divines have not cared to discuss whether it is based upon an express command, since the proof of appointment by Christ, or His Apostles, would "serve the turn;"* and this the candid Mr. Goode represents as a virtual abandonment of the divine right of Episcopacy! He says our divines "ONLY" contend for the *Apostolical* institution of Episcopacy! This "only" being foisted in to convey a meaning as far as possible from that of the original writer.

If Mr. Goode had commenced his quotation where Sanderson begins his paragraph, the reader would

* Sanderson declined disputing about the "stricter sense." "Such determination being clearly of NO MOMENT AT ALL to my purpose."

hardly have needed our correction. Immediately preceding the words quoted from him, he says:

"The truth is, all this ado about *jus divinum*, is, in the last result, no more than a mere *verbal nicety;* the term being not always taken in one and the same latitude of signification."

His judgment of "divine right," however, is not at all doubtful. He speaks of it thus:

"Which, besides that it is CLEAR, *from evident texts of* SCRIPTURE, and from the testimony of as ancient and authentic records as the world has any to show, for the attesting of any other part of Ecclesiastical story; it is also, in truth, a *part of the* ESTABLISHED DOCRINE *of the Church of England*, evidently deduced out of sundry passages in the Book of Consecration, etc., (which Book is approved in the Articles of Religion, and subscribed unto by all persons that have heretofore taken Orders in the Church, or Degrees in the University), and *has been* CONSTANTLY and UNIFORMLY MAINTAINED *by our best writers, and by* ALL THE ORDERLY, SOBER, AND ORTHODOX SONS OF THIS CHURCH."—(Pages 17, 20.)

BISHOP PEARSON, of Chester, (born 1612—died 1686,) author of the elaborate exposition of the Creed, which is still, and likely ever to be, the text book upon that subject. On the ninth article of the Creed he says:

"All the Churches of God are united into *one* by the *unity of discipline and government*, by virtue whereof the same Christ ruleth in them all. For they all have the *same* pastoral guides appointed, authorized, sanctified, and set apart by the appointment of God."

But he speaks still more strongly in his "Minor Works:"

"That the Order of the Ministry is *necessary* to the countenance of the gospel, according to the promise of Christ, as it was to the first plantation of it * * * is a doctrine indubitable. That this ministry is derived by *Succession* * * and that the unity and peace of the Church of Christ are to be conserved by a *due and legitimate ordination*, no man who considereth the practice of the Apostles and ecclesiastical history, *can ever*

doubt." "We can boldly and truly affirm that we are the same with the primitive Christians.

"But if we once admit a diversity in our ordinations, *we have lost the honor of Succession;* we have cast away our weapon of defence; we have betrayed our own cause, and laid ourselves open to the common enemy of all Protestants, and we shall at last inevitably fall into the Socinian doctrine to deny all necessity or use of any mission or ordination."—(*Works*, edited by Churton, Vol. ii., p. 232.)

To one who asks him, as a "moderate divine," to resolve certain doubts about receiving Sacraments, etc., from one who in the Puritan times had been appointed to the ministry, he replies:

"*If you doubt whether his ordination be valid, or conclude it to be* NULL, *I confess I know no argument to convince you or incline you to another persuasion.*" "If you be resolved that your pastor established is not a Priest or Presbyter, *and consequently hath no power to consecrate the elements* * * * *I cannot see how you can follow him to the Holy Table,* or with what comfort or conscience you can bring your family, or concur with your neighbors to receive the elements at his hands."—(Page 236.)

With Pearson, we end our series from men of that age in which those flourished who might be called Laudean. Some of those from whom we have quoted, have been strongly opposed to the course of Laud in several respects; but it would puzzle the reader to discover who they were, by their judgments upon the subjects we are considering. We find that Taylor, Cosin and Sanderson are not a whit less liberal, or more exclusive than Hall, Davenant, or Pearson. They all agree with the divines of the previous century; and so what has been said of Laudeans causing a change in the opinions prevalent in the Church, is just as incorrect as what was said of their changing its laws.

From this point we must cease giving notices of the authors, and be sparing with explanations.

JOSEPH MEDE, (1586–1638):

"Our Church, you know, goes upon differing principles from the rest of the Reformed, and so steers her course by another rule than they do. We look after the form, rites, and discipline of antiquity, and endeavor to bring our own, as near as we can, to that pattern. We suppose the Reformed Churches have departed farther therefrom than needed, and so we are not very solicitous to comply with them; *yea, we are jealous of such of our own as we see over-zealously addicted to them, lest it be a sign they prefer them before their Mother.*"—(*Letter to Mr. Hartlibb.*) *

DR. PETER HEYLIN (1600–1662). Speaking of the perpetual oversight of the Church, he says:

"This, since they could not do in person, they were to do it by Successors; who, by their office, were to be the ordinary Pastors of the Church, and vicars of Christ. Now, if you ask the Fathers who they were, that were accounted, in their times and ages, *the Successors of the Apostles*, they will, with one accord, make answer, that *the Bishops were.*"—(*On Episcopacy*, Vol. i., p. 16.)

DR. ROBERT SOUTH (1633–1716):

"I must confess that I cannot look upon Titus as so far *unbishoped*, yet but that he still exhibits to us all the essentials of that jurisdiction, which to this day is claimed for Episcopal." —(*Phila. Edition*, 1845, Vol. i., p. 75.)

"The Church of England being once suppressed, no other sect or Church among us * * has any bottom or foundation, or, indeed, any tolerable pretence to set up and settle itself upon." —(Vol. ii., p. 489.)

"It was an observation and saying of a judicious prelate, that of all the sorts of enemies which our Church had, there was none so deadly, so pernicious, and likely to prove so fatal to it, as the *conforming* Puritan." "He is one who lives by the Altar, and turns his back upon it; one who catches at the preferments of the Church, but hates the discipline and Orders of it; one who practices conformity as papists take oaths and tests, that is, with an inward abhorrence of what he does for the present,

* Quoted in "*Tracts for the Times*," Vol. ii., p. 440.

and a resolution to act quite contrary when occasion serves; one who, during his conformity, will be sure to be known by such a distinguished badge as shall point him out to, and secure his credit with the dissenting brotherhood," etc., etc.—(*Ibid*, 493.)

BISHOP STILLINGFLEET (1635–1699) while not yet of age to enter the priesthood, wrote a work called the "Irenicum," in which he argued against Episcopacy by divine right. He afterwards disclaimed the doctrine thus advanced, and protested against being judged by that work of his youth.* Yet, notwithstanding this, it is still reprinted, and constantly quoted by writers on the Presbyterian side, as conveying *Bishop* Stillingfleet's opinion:

"That our Church did believe our Bishops to succeed the Apostles in those [the ordinary] parts of their office, I shall make appear by these things: (1) In the preface before the Book of Ordinations, it is said that, 'it is *evident* unto all men,' etc., etc. What is the reason that they express it thus: 'from the Apostles' time,' but that they believed, while the Apostles [lived], they managed the affairs of government themselves: but as they withdrew, they did, in some Churches sooner, and in some later, * * commit the care and government to such persons whom they appointed thereto. Of which we have an uncontrollable evidence in the case of Timothy and Titus * * * So that we may allow for the community of names between Bishop and Presbyter, for a while in the Church; that is, *while the Apostles governed the Churches themselves*. But afterward, that which was then part of the Apostolical office, became Episcopal; which hath continued from that time to this, by *constant* SUCCESSION *in the Church*."—(*Unreasonableness of Separation*, Part iii., Sect. 13.)

BISHOP GRIFFITH WILLIAMS, of Ossory.

"We have now two sorts of *lay preachers*, (1) one without *any* ordination, (2) the other with a *false* ordination; and this

* "Will you not allow one single person who happened to write about these matters *when he was very young*, in TWENTY YEARS' time of the most busy and thoughtful part of his life, to see reason to alter his judgment?"—(*Preface to Unreasonableness.*)

false ordination, *that is done by other Presbyters, without the Bishop, is* NO ORDINATION AT ALL; no otherwise than when my Lord Chancellor makes one a justice of the peace, and that justice of the peace will presently take upon him to make other justices of the peace like himself. And *you know the authority of such second justices is of no validity*, because the one had no power to give it, nor the other any right to use it. And *so is it with these Presbyters that are made only by Presbyters; they are none other than* MERE LAICS."—(*Great Antichrist*, small folio, 1661, pp. 22, 23.)

BISHOP ED. REYNOLDS, of Norwich (1595–1676), formerly a Puritan:

"Christ was called of God our High Priest after the Order of Melchisedec, even so were his Apostles sent by Him; and by *authority from Him they did ordain others unto the same service, and direct the same course to be pursued afterwards.* From Him, therefore, and those whom he hath appointed, must we receive both our mission and our message."

The call is twofold, internal and external * * * "The external call, instituted by Christ in his Apostles, *is managed by their successors*, the BISHOPS and Pastors of the Church." * * "Separation and solemn consecration were done in the Church assembly," "with the rite of imposition of hands, importing (1) a dedicating and devoting the person to the office, and (2) *deriving authority to minister office.*"—(*Works*, in folio, 1678, p. 1038.)

BISHOP SAMUEL PARKER, of Oxford (1640–1687):

"It is an undeniable truth that the Apostolical office was Episcopal, and the Episcopal Apostolical, both of them consisting in the supreme government of the Church; so that an Apostle was a moving Bishop, to found Churches, and a Bishop a settled Apostle, to govern them."—(*Account of Government of Christian Church*, 12mo., London, 1683.)

"The Bishop of that Church in Tertullian's time was known to have succeeded the Apostle in that See, as now one Bishop doth another; and what Tertullian means by that is evident, in that he reckons up THREE ORDERS of the Clergy,—Bishop, Priest, and Deacon; and gives such a supremacy to the Bishop as to allow nothing to be done in the Church by Presbyters or Deacons, without his authority."—(P. 17.)

"This one would think more than enough to satisfy the utmost demands that any ingenuous man could make for the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION OF EPISCOPACY.—(P. 23.)

Speaking of the common use in the New Testament of the same word for different offices, and different words for the same office, he says:

"And yet what volumes hath this one lean and forced conclusion brought forth against the Apostolical Succession of Bishops! Nay, it is the only thing, besides St. Jerome's rash expressions, that supports the controversie."—(P. 26.)

HERBERT THORNDIKE died 1672. He quotes approvingly from Salmasius:

"Bishops are set over their Churches *plenissime* in the fullest right, and that therefore ordination was reserved to them; which is to say, that in all things they have a special interest, but *especially* ORDINATION *is their peculiar.*"—(*Review of Right of the Church*, p. 77.)

ARCHBISHOP SPOTISWOOD (1565–1639):

"As touching the government of the Church, I am verily persuaded that the government Episcopal is the ONLY *right and Apostolical form.*"—(*Last Will and Testament.*)

DR. THOMAS JACKSON (1579–1640) was another of those intellectual giants of whom our Church can boast. So thorough and profound were his usual discourses, that clergymen resorted to his Church whenever it was possible; and the saying was common that, "his pulpit was like a Professor's chair." About twenty-five years ago, his Treatise on the Church was reprinted by Mr. Goode; from it we make the following extracts. The reader will bear in mind that this Treatise, being written against Romanists, with whom, as to the theory of Succession, etc., we have no debate, there is in it no defence of that theory; it and Episcopacy are taken for granted.

"It is, then, profession of the same faith, participation of the Sacraments, and *subjection to the same laws and ordinances ecclesiastic*, which makes the visible Church to be one."—(*Two Treatises*, etc., etc., Phil. edit., p. 59.)

"The mere spiritual power with which alone the Apostles and their immediate Successors were endued, was of greater efficacy than both the remainder of the like spiritual power in later Bishops and pastors, and all the strength of secular or civil power wherewith princes, states, or kingdoms * * * have, as they were in conscience and *de jure divino* bound, assisted Prelates and Church governors."—(P. 61.)

"Prelates" "are always to remember that this power is given them, not for destruction, or to show their own greatness, and therefore never to be used but upon special and weighty occasions."—(P. 116.)

"Though no heretic be a true member of the Church, and therefore no true Priest, yet, so long as he is in the Priest's place (in Sacerdotio), the acts of his ministry or priesthood be good. Now, though the Pope or Bishop of Rome be more than a heretic, even the Antichrist or man of sin * * * nevertheless, seeing (as the Apostle saith) *he sits in the temple of God*, even the acts of *his* ministration or priesthood are good; nor are the *Bishops* consecrated by him so polluted by communion with him in their consecration *but their* EPISCOPAL ACTS, as the ORDINATION OF MINISTERS, the administration of Sacraments prescribed by Christ and his Apostles," etc., etc.—(P. 167.)

Dr. ISAAC BARROW (1630-1677). This unequalled divine, who has never been accused of narrowness, bears the following testimony in his sermon on Hebrews xiii., 17:

"The Church is *acies ordinata*, a well-marshalled army, wherein, under the Captain-General of our faith and salvation, * * * there are divers Captains serving in fit degrees of subordination: Bishops commanding larger regiments, Presbyters ordering less numerous companies."

"Of this distinction there never was, in ancient times, made any question, nor did it seem disputable in the Church, except by one malcontent (Aerius), who did, indeed, get a name in story, but never made much noise or obtained any vogue in the world. Very few followers he found in his heterodoxy; *no great body, even of heretics, could find cause to dissent from the Church on this point;* but all, Arians, Macedonians, Novatians, Donatists, etc., maintained the distinction of Ecclesiastical Orders among themselves, and acknowledged the duty of the inferior clergy to their Bishops."

He then goes on to show that such subordination is required by reason:

"An army cannot be without a general, a senate without a president, a corporation without a chief magistrate; this, all experience attesteth; *this, even the chief impugners of Episcopal presidency do by their practice confess*, who, for the prevention of disorder, have been fain of their own heads to devise Ecclesiastical subordinations, * * * and to appoint moderators (or temporary Bishops) in their assemblies; so that reason hath forced the dissenters from the Church to imitate it."

"The Holy Scripture also doth plainly enough countenance this distinction; for therein we have represented one 'Angel' presiding over principal Churches which contained several Presbyters; therein we find Episcopal ordination and jurisdiction exercised."

"I shall only farther add that if any man be so dully or so affectedly ignorant as not to see the reason of the case, and the *dangerous consequences* of rejecting this ancient form of discipline; *if any be so overweeningly presumptuous as to question the faith of all history, or to disavow those monuments, and that tradition, upon the testimony whereof even the truth and certainty of our religion and all its sacred oracles do rely;* if any be so perversely contentious as to oppose the custom and current practice of the Churches through all ages down to the last age. * * * * * *Upon such a person we may look as one utterly invincible and intractable. So weak a judgment and so strong a will who can hope by reason to convert?*"

Speaking of the "false Apostles" who resisted the "true Apostles," and "intruded themselves into that high office," he says:

"No wonder, then, it may be that now in these dregs of time there should be many who disavow and desert their true guides, transferring the observance due to them upon bold pretenders, who are not, indeed, guides, but seducers; not governors, but usurpers and sacrilegious invaders of this holy office."

He then goes to give the marks by which genuine guides may be known. They are those who preach the gospel faithfully, administer the Sacraments gravely and duly, etc., and

"THOSE WHO DERIVE THEIR AUTHORITY BY A CONTINUED SUCCESSION FROM THE APOSTLES, who are called unto and constituted in their office in a regular and peaceable way agreeable to the institution of God, and the constant practice of his Church."

"As they [the Apostles] did challenge to themselves *an au-*

thority from CHRIST to exercise these and the like acts of spiritual dominion and jurisdiction, as we do also see the like acts exercised by BISHOPS whom they did constitute to feed and rule the Church, so we may reasonably conceive all governors of the Church [the heirs of their office] invested with *like authority* in order to the same purpose, and that correspondent obedience is due to them."—(*Works*, 8vo. ed., London, Vol. iii., pp. 109-130.)

Dr. RICH'D. ALLESTREE (1619–1680). Regius professor of theology at Oxford:

"The separateness of the functions of the Clergy, the incommunicableness of their office to persons not separated for them, is so express a doctrine, both of the letter of the text and of the Holy Ghost, that sure I need not to say more." * * * "And here I might tell you of 'bearing rule,' of 'thrones,' of 'stars,' and 'angels,' and other words of a high sense, and yet not go out of the scripture bounds, although the dignity did not die with the scripture age, nor expire with the Apostles. The age as low as Photius words it thus: 'that Apostolical and divine dignity which the chief priests are acknowledged to be possessed of by right of Succession.'"—(*Sermon* xvi., fol. ed., 1684; also quoted in *Tracts for Times*, Amer. Ed., vol. ii., page 146.)

HENRY DODWELL (1641–1711), although a layman was a profoundly learned theologian and teacher of divinity. His opinions were very decided indeed, and would come nearer to Mr. Goode's representation of exclusiveism than any we know of. He wrote a thick quarto volume on the Sinfulness of Schism, in which he maintained at length that "Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government is Schismatical." He shows the superiority of Episcopal Churches to all others in this way: salvation is offered to man through a Covenant of mercy, but a right to the promises or benefits of that covenant cannot ordinarily be possessed except by entering into it and partaking of the ordinances which are its tokens and pledges; and that these, with any *certainty of validity*,

can only be had in a rightly and perfectly constituted branch of the Church Catholic; and that this Church has ever been and must ever be Episcopal in its constitution, because so instituted by divine direction:

"The visible Church wherein they may expect to find these ordinary means, is the Episcopal in opposition to all other societies not Episcopally governed."—(*On Schism*, London, 1679, p. 166.)

"The validity of the Sacraments depends upon the authority of the persons by whom they are administered." "No other ministers have this lawful authority but only they of the Episcopal communion."—(Page 168.)

Of this work the 24th and 25th chapters are expressly devoted to proving the "Nullity of Ordinations among the Non-Conformists."

Of this same date we have an anonymous work, which, from its exactness and fulness of learning, might pass for Dodwell's, but yet is not. It is called a "Brief Account of the Ancient Church Government," and is an elaborate reply to the Presbyterian plea — their *Jus Divinum Ministerii*, and to Blondel's Apology. The writer divides his work into four parts. In the first he shows that the Apostles were the Successors of Christ; in the second that Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles; in the third he presents the Presbyterian plea against Bishops; and in the fourth he replies to it:

"All parts of Apostolical authority were not given to all whom the Apostles ordained, with an exact equality amongst them; but some authority (as that of ORDAINING * * * *) given to some particular persons, with a subordination to them of the rest."—(Page 40.)

"It is needless to show any further out of later Fathers, the authority of Bishops to have been superior to Presbyters in their own times; for who with any face can deny this. But this may be to purpose to show you out of them this authority of Bishops (superior to Presbyters), which was practised in their times to have been held by them as of Apostolical, or yet

higher, of our LORD'S INSTITUTION, and so of Apostolical Succession."—(Page 62.)

As to whether Bishops and Presbyters be of totally different Orders, or only of different degrees in the same Order, this author says, the possession of higher authority and special powers should show superiority of Order; yet

"If different functions may not distinguish these higher Orders * * * let this controversy be stated as any one pleaseth, only so that the Bishops be still acknowledged to have been admitted to this superior *gradus* by a new ordination or consecration (call it as you please), even in the most ancient records of the Church, and by this to have committed to them those special acts or Acts Ecclesiastical, which, if the inferior *gradus* sacerdotal did assume, *it was always accounted by the Church* INVALID, NULL, AND EFFECTLESS."

BISHOP LLOYD of St. Asaph (1627–1717) published in 1684 his "Historical Account of Church Government in Great Britain," etc., which he dedicated to the "Rev. Dr. Stillingfleet, Dean of St. Paul's, and the pious and learned Mr. Henry Dodwell," in acknowledgment to "them in particular of the debt that is owing from the whole Church to all that have stood up in the breach against her enemies." He thus shows the Universality of Episcopacy:

"In that laborious collection of Blondel's, which was made for the service of our Presbyterians, he, with all his vast reading, could not find one undoubted example of a Church of their way in the ancient times, but only that of the Scots'." (Preface.)

And in respect to this, the Bishop proceeds to show that Blondel was entirely wrong:

"But (as it hath pleased God) there is no want of instance to prove that Episcopacy was settled here as it was in other countries. First we find at the Council of Arles (which was called by Constantine the Great in the year 314) * * * there were out of Britain three Bishops, one Priest, and one Deacon."

From the Canons of this Council he quotes a passage ending thus:

"And that the Presbyters do nothing without leave of the Bishop."

"The last words which set forth the Episcopal power are the same in effect with those of the epistles of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, which have been often produced in defence of Episcopal authority. No man that considers the antiquity of that Father who died within ten years after St. John the Apostle, can doubt whether his kind of Episcopacy were the government the Apostles left in the Church."—(Pp. 73–4.)

Dr. JOHN SCOTT (1638–1694) in his Christian Life:

"We read of the Church of Jerusalem * * of Antioch, Ephesus, etc.; which Churches, doubtless, consisted of several congregations in and about those populous cities, which were all united into one body under the care and inspection of one Bishop or Governor."—(Page 294.)

"No congregation can lawfully communicate in the public offices of divine worship without a lawful pastor to administer it; *no collection of congregations can lawfully exert an Act of Church government without having an authorized governor to exercise it.*"—(Page 296.)

"There is a *standing form of government* and discipline in the Church, *instituted by our Saviour himself*, which, as I shall show hereafter, is this, that there should be an EPISCOPACY, or Order of men authorized in a *continued* SUCCESSION *from the* APOSTLES (who were authorized by Himself), to oversee and govern all those particular Churches into which the Church Catholic should be hereafter distributed; *to* ORDAIN *inferior Ministers* to teach, and instruct, and administer the holy offices to particular congregations."—(Page 310.)

"These things, therefore, being all of divine institution, are the essentials of Christian government and discipline, in which all Christian Churches are *obliged* to communicate with each other. *And this being the standing form and discipline of the Catholic Churches, no particular Church or community of Christians can refuse to communicate in it* without dividing itself from the communion of the Church Catholic. I say *refuse to communicate in it*, because it is possible for a Church to be without this government, which yet doth neither refuse it, nor the communion of any other Church for the sake of it. A Church may be debarred of it by *unavoidable necessity* in despite of its power, and against its consent, and under this circumstance I can by no means think *such* a Church to be separated from the Church

Catholic. It is, indeed, an *imperfect* and *defective* part of the Catholic Church, and if this defect of it be any way owing to its own negligence, it is a very great fault in it, as well as an unhappiness. But though this instituted government is necessary to the *perfection* of a Church, it does not necessarily follow that it is necessary to the *being* of it."—(Page 312.)

"But though a community of Christians may be a true part of the Catholic Church and in communion with it, though it hath no Episcopacy, yet it is a plain case that if it *rejects the Episcopacy and separates from the communion of it*, it *thereby* wholly divides itself from the communion of the Catholic Church."—(p. 313, 4th Ed., 12mo., *London*, 1697, Vol. iii.)

Dr. GEORGE HICKES (1642–1715) was ordained to the Episcopate by the non-jurors, but never held jurisdiction as a Bishop:

"May not God set apart a perpetual Order and Succession of public officers and ministers in his Church forever to attend to those things?"—(*Christian Priesthood*, Oxford Ed. 1847, Vol. i., p. 258.)

Speaking of what is given under the name of The Holy Ghost in ordination, he says:

"Most certainly the Gifts, which, by a metonymy in Scripture, are often called the Spirit, and which, in consecration and ordination, they give to the persons consecrated or ordained. But how? Not in their own name; but as Peter gave soundness to the lame man when he said, 'silver and gold have I none, but such as I have, give I thee in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth; rise up and walk.'"—(Page 261.)

On page 267 he quotes the following from the infidel Tindal:

"It is the *prevailing opinion* that the BISHOPS are by *divine appointment* governors of the Christian Church, and *that no one is capable of being of that number who derives not his right by an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in the Catholic Church.* I will now show some of the numerous absurdities of this hypothesis."

So, then, the first direct opponent of Apostolical Succession that we meet with is this unbeliever. In reply to him, Hickes proceeds:

"*That Bishops* ARE *by divine appointment, and derive their right by* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION, *is no hypothesis*, as he calls it, but *matter of* FACT, believed and practised for fifteen hundred years in the Christian Church."

"The next argument he brings against this Episcopal form of government, hath been brought and answered many times. It consists in nothing but spiteful and invidious clamor against the divine right of Episcopacy for 'weakening the Protestant cause;' 'for unchurching the Reformed Churches in other countries, particularly that in Scotland.' To which I answer, first, that no strict doctrines are to be rejected for the severity of their consequences upon men who will not believe them, or, if they believe, will not practice them." "But, as our author truly speaks, it is they, themselves, that '*unchurch themselves*' * * * by throwing off a government which was *instituted by God for the* PERPETUAL *and* UNALTERABLE POLITY of the Church."

"I speak this with reluctance, though with freedom and plainness. I call God to witness, *not* to reproach the Protestants of other Churches, who have advocated Episcopacy, but in great charity and pity to them, beseeching them to consider if, *indeed* they can justify themselves to Christ and the Christian world for abdicating it, and departing from the constitution and mission of the Catholic Church. THEY ALL, except in one place [Scotland], PLEAD NECESSITY *for departing from it*, and I would to God their plea were good. But *the necessities* they plead are necessities of their own making and continuing; *chosen and wilful necessities;* and, I am forced to say by consequences, unjustifiable necessities, out of which they may, and I think therefore ought to extricate themselves as soon as they can." —(Pp. 269–271.)

Dr. Hickes edited and published, in 1708, a work entitled "The Divine Right of Episcopacy Asserted, by a Presbyter of the Church of England." From this we quote a single passage:

"Episcopacy is of divine institution in these three senses." "For if Jesus Christ has appointed it in his Gospel to be the government of His Church, as I doubt not to make it appear, it is past controversy that it is of divine institution; since it is the Son of God Himself that is the author of it. But, admitting that we should not meet with the formal and positive establishment of it by Him * * * if the Apostles have set it forth as men divinely inspired, it must be confessed that it is of divine institution. * * * And, lastly, if the Apostles, by virtue of their commission from Jesus Christ, have founded such a form of

Church government in the Christian Church, it must be likewise, if not immediately, yet mediately, as being grounded upon a divine authority."—(P. 12.)

BISHOP SAMUEL BRADFORD, of Rochester (1652–1731):

"The plain and certain account which we have of the distinction of Bishop and Presbyters, as superior and inferior officer, in the several Churches planted by the Apostles of which we have any history, even down successively from their times, is of itself a testimony so very clear, that it is hard to conceive how any that are not slaves to an hypothesis should withstand the force of it."—(*Consecration Sermon at Lambeth Chapel*, p. 7.)

BISHOP BURNET (1643–1715), the well-known writer of the History of Reformation, and expounder of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Part of his comment upon the 23d is quoted by Mr. Goode as follows:

"If a company of Christians find the public worship where they live to be so defiled that they cannot with a good conscience join in it, and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely and in a regular way; if, I say, such a body, finding some that have been ordained, though to the lower functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct, or, finding none of those, should by a common consent desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things, and should upon that beginning grow up to a regulated constitution, *though we are very sure that* THIS IS QUITE OUT OF ALL RULE, *and could not be done without* A VERY GREAT SIN, *unless the* NECESSITY WERE GREAT AND APPARENT; yet, if the necessity *is real* and *not feigned*, this is not condemned or annulled by the Article; for when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a Body, who are supposed to have an authority in such an extraordinary case, *whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of this Church for above half an age after did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the Foreign Churches, so constituted, to be true Churches, as to all the essentials of a Church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state.*"

We might allow this to pass, as correct enough, but for that part of it that involves the idea that laymen

can originate a ministry and a Church; which idea was never tolerated by the Church of England for a moment. Burnet was one of the most determined Low Church partisans of his day (and, indeed, more of a politician than a divine), yet his Exposition contains abundant proof that he held to the divine right of Episcopacy, and Mr. Goode's own quotation implies it. Our space will not allow us to give more than a sentence or two in addition:

"In the New Testament our Lord called the twelve Apostles and sent them out. He also sent out upon another occasion seventy disciples; and before He left His Apostles he told them, that as His Father had sent him, so He sent them; which seems to import, that as He was sent into the world with this among other powers, that He might send others in His name, so He likewise empowered them to do the same * * so they appointed others over the particular Churches in which they fixed them: such were Epaphras or Epaphroditus at Colosse, Timothy at Ephesus, and Titus in Crete. To them the Apostles gave AUTHORITY; otherwise it was a needless thing to write so many directions to them in order to their conduct." "These rules given to Timothy and Titus do plainly import that there was to be an AUTHORITY in the Church, and that no man was to assume this authority to himself."

"The Apostles settled order and government in the Church, not so much for the age in which they themselves lived, as once to establish and give credit to constitutions that they foresaw would be *yet more necessary* to the succeeding ages."

But the reader ought to know that the comment on the 23d Article, which is so triumphantly brought forward by Mr. Goode and his followers, was *especially censured* by the Convocation. The Lower House complained,

(1) "That the said book tends to introduce *such a latitude* and diversity of opinions *as the Articles were framed to avoid.* (2) That there are many passages in the exposition of the several Articles which appear to us to be *contrary to the true meaning of them* and to other received doctrines of our Church."—(*Lathbury's History*, p. 355.)

The Bishops, who were nearly all of the Government party, refused to entertain the complaint; but it remains on the record.

BISHOP BEVERIDGE (1636–1707).—We turn now to another Prelate, who was vastly more learned than Burnet, and at least as able. He also was a Low Churchman, but in the best (that is, the non-political) sense of the term. Few better men have ever lived. He too wrote a commentary on the Articles, from which we print a few extracts:

"Though there be but one God men are called to this [the ministerial] office by, yet there be two ways which He is pleased to call them in. Some he calls immediately, from Himself without men; others mediately from Himself by men. The first manner of calling the Prophets and Apostles had." * * *

"Christ called the Apostles; the Apostles, by the appointment of the same Christ, called others to succeed them; they again others; and *so hath there been a* SUCCESSION *of lawful ministers ever since.*" "*So that* NONE *are now lawful ministers but such as are thus called by Him, and* ALL *that are thus called by Him* ARE *lawful ministers.* I mean all such as are called by such as succeed them in the ministry who were called immediately from Christ himself; for these are they which CERTAINLY we are to understand by those mentioned in this Article, 'who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation or Church to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.'"—(*On 23d Article.*)

"If we once suppose that the primitive Church generally erred in their ordination of ministers, then we must grant also that there hath never been a lawful ministry since; *the lawfulness of their ministry depending chiefly, yea only, on the lawfulness of their ordination* * * * and *if there be no lawful ministry, there can be no true Church, because the word is not lawfully preached, nor the Sacraments lawfully administered in it.*"—(*On 36th Article.*)

He then goes on to show that the power of ordination was always confessed to be the property of Bishops, and of them alone:

"And thus we see how in the primitive Church it was Bishops only that ordained Priests, and *they were* NO PRIESTS WHO WERE

NOT ORDAINED BY BISHOPS; insomuch that St. Chrysostom, and yea, and St. Jerome himself too, could not but say that Ordination * * was peculiar to Bishops. So that though Presbyters should be thought to be equal to Bishops in other things, yet in this business of Ordination Bishops must needs be acknowledged to be above them."—(*Ibid.*, Oxford ed., p. 554.)

Against such exposition as this the Church never objected.

From his sermons we print a single sentence:

"As for schism, they certainly hazard their salvation at a strange rate, who separate from such a Church as ours is, wherein the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, *the root of all Christian communion*, hath been so entirely preserved, and the word and sacraments are so effectually administered; and all to go unto *such assemblies and meetings as can have no pretence to the promise in my text!*"—(*Sermon on "Lo I am with you always,"* etc., etc.)

MATTHEW SCRIVENER published his "Course of Divinity" in 1674. Of Succession he speaks thus:

"How is it possible to distinguish them whom Christ hath appointed to constitute others in the Church, from them to whom He hath given no such order, but by this Succession we now speak of, namely, a traduction of that faculty which is in one (deriving it originally, though by many intermediate hands, from Christ himself), to another succeeding him."—(Fol., London, p. 130.)

Speaking of persons taking the ministry upon them "without ordinary grant," he says:

"*This evil is only remedied by a successive and ordinary transmission of that power which Christ left with certain peculiar persons he called Apostles, with authority to communicate the same to others to the world's end*, according to the SEVERAL RANKS and ORDERS of Ministers of which his Church consisteth."—(*Ibid.*.)

JAMES BOYS, Vicar of Coggeshall in Essex, was also author of an exposition of the Articles. His opinions are very decidedly given:

"After the decease of the Apostles, the Bishops ordained by them set apart others to succeed themselves; and thus the ministry lawfully called hath continued in the Church to this day."

"It can be no other than a violation of God's order, and an unlawful intrusion into His sanctuary, when men take this office upon them in a way different from the practice of the Apostolical age and primitive times."

"Are they true ministers that plead they receive their commission from the Spirit only, and are moved by the Holy Ghost? Our Church says they are not." * * *

"*Are those, then, true ministers which own they receive it from men, from the* PRESBYTERS *of the Church* by the imposition of hands and prayer? OUR CHURCH DECLARES AGAINST THESE; for the Article says they must be called to the work by men who have public authority given them in the Congregation to call and send ministers. This congregation can be reputed no other than the Catholic Church; and *that has* NEVER *given or allowed unto Presbyters alone power or authority to send laborers into God's vineyard.*"—(Second edition, London, 1717, pp. 152, 155.)

DR. RICHARD FIDDES (1671–1725), in his Body of Divinity, published in 1717, says:

"If ordinations to the sacred offices had been unlawful or invalid, either without the authority of the Apostles or in opposition to it, they must be *equally unlawful or invalid when they are performed either without or against the authority of their Successors.*" * * * Ancient writers "all unanimously agree in this conclusion, that Bishops are an Order superior to Presbyters, to whom the supreme power of jurisdiction in the several Churches belonged, and *who had the* SOLE POWER OF ORDAINING others; and that they did accordingly, in fact, succeed in the Episcopate, and alone exercise that power."—(Book iv., chap. ii., fol., Dublin, 1718, Vol. i., p. 290.)

And again he speaks thus decidedly:

"THE SUCCESSION *in each of the* THREE ORDERS *was always derived from* EPISCOPAL *hands; and as* BISHOPS ONLY *had the power to ordain, no ordination by other hands could be or ever was admitted as having any force or validity.*"

"Whether the NECESSITY pleaded for at the Reformation, for abolishing the Episcopal office, was real or only pretended, or however God, in *cases of necessity*, may excuse honest and well-meaning persons in the breach of his own constitutions, yet neither in the reason of the thing, nor from any facts recorded in the Holy Scriptures, can it be proved that *facts done by a mere* HUMAN *or other incompetent authority, towards conveying any* DIVINE POWERS, *can be in themselves of the least force or validity.*"—(Vol. ii., p. 117.)

THE LONDON CASES were a set of very moderate expostulations and reasons, presented in the hope of recovering Dissenters to the Church of England. They were published in 1698. Among the writers were Archbishops Tillotson, Sharpe, and Tenison, Bishops Grove, Sherlock, Williams, Fowler, and Patrick, Dr. Cave, Dr. Hooper, etc., etc. Owing to their special purpose the Cases are rather apologetic in tone, and indeed some of the writers, being almost as latitudinarian as they could be with honesty, would not, under any ordinary circumstances have written differently. Notwithstanding this, however, the volume contains much that is worth considering, much that our extreme Low Churchman of the present times would hardly accept. *Ex. Gra.:*

"Some who communicate ordinarily with the Church of England make no scruple to communicate, in prayers and Sacraments, with Presbyterian and Independent [or Congregational] Churches; * * * * *and some think it very indifferent whom they communicate with*, and therefore take their turns in all. But this is as contrary to all the principles of Church communion as anything can possibly be."

"To be in communion with the Church is to be a member of it; and to be a member of two separate and opposite Churches is to be as contrary to ourselves as those separate Churches are to each other. Christ hath but ONE CHURCH and ONE BODY, *and therefore where there are two Churches, divided from each other by separate communions, there is a schism and rent in the body; and whoever communicates with both these Churches*, on one side or the other, *communicates in a Schism.*"

"That the Presbyterian and Independent Churches have made an actual separation from the Church of England, I have evidently proved already; and therefore, if the communion of the Church of England be lawful * * * then they are schismatics, and to communicate with them is to partake in their schism."—(Small Fol., London, 1698, p. 35.)

ARCHBISHOP SHARPE, of York (1644–1713).—Referring to our Lord's command (Matt. xxviii., 19, 20), he says:

"This commission of our Saviour we may properly style the charter of the Church; and mind, I pray, what is contained in it. Our Saviour here declares the extent of his Church, and of what persons he would have it constituted. It was to extend throughout all the world, and to be made up of all nations. He here declares upon what grounds He would have it constituted. * * * * Lastly, He here promises the perpetual presence of His Holy Spirit, both to assist the Apostles and their Successors in the building and governing this Church, and to actuate and enliven all the members of it."—(*Sermon on* 1 Cor. xii., 13, in Vol. vii., pp. 87, 88.)

CHARLES LESLIE (1650–1732).—This almost unequalled reasoner and very zealous defender of the Church, speaking of proposed surrender of Church privileges, says, in his "Regale and Pontificat":*

"How can rights that are divine be given up? If they are DIVINE no *human* authority can either supersede or limit them. If they are divine, it is sacrilege to invade them or give them up." * * * "Assert your divine rights in full tail; leave not a hoof of them behind. Who dare oppose what they acknowledge to be *divine?*"—(*Preface.*)

On page 32, he quotes approvingly the following from Sherlock:

"If Bishops will not exercise *that power which* CHRIST *has given them*, they are accountable to their Lord for it; but they cannot give it away, neither from themselves nor from their Successors, for it is theirs only to use, not to part with it."—(*Ibid.*)

At page 167 we find him replying to the question, "What is the proper office of the priesthood, and for what was it ordained?" We believe that Mr. Goode would be very unwilling to reprint his treatment of this subject. He says the proper notion of the Christian ministry had been quite taken away, "in our late times of schism and rebellion:"

"To make way for *those who had* NO COMMISSION to show for

* Second edition, 12mo., London, 1701.

their usurping that sacred office. Therefore they reduced it all to *preaching*, and loved the name of *Preachers* better than that of *Priests*."—(P. 173.)

"They said that other men [without deriving any Succession from the Apostles] could read the Gospel and the Absolution or Retaining of sins therein contained, as well as any Bishop, or [any] Priest ordained by him. So they might [read] a patent, a pardon, or a declaration of war, as well as any judge or herald; but *with this difference*, that *their* doing of it, who are not legally empowered, signifies *just nothing*."—(P. 174.)

From his tract on the "Qualifications Requisite to Administer the Sacraments," we will give a single extract:

"The validity of Episcopal ordination * * the Church of Rome does own; and the Presbyterians dare not deny it, because they would thereby overthrow all their own ordinations; for the Presbyters who reformed (as they call it) 'from Bishops, received their ordination from Bishops.'"

"And, therefore, *though the Episcopal principles do invalidate the ordination by Presbyters*, yet the Presbyterian principles do not invalidate the ordination by Bishops; so that *the validity of Episcopal ordination stands* SAFE ON ALL SIDES, even by confession of those who are enemies to the Episcopal Order." "Whereas, on the other hand, *the validity of the Presbyterian ordinations is avowed by* NONE BUT THEMSELVES, and they have all the rest of the world as opposite to them,"

"But because the design of this discourse is to show the SUCCESSION *from the* APOSTLES, I answer, that *this succession is preserved and derived* ONLY *in the* BISHOPS."—(*Works*, in folio, 1722, Vol. ii., p. 721.)

"To state the case the most impartially, to receive Baptism from these dissenters is at least a hazard of many thousands to one." "*But to receive it from the Bishop or Episcopal clergy, has no hazard at all as to its validity*, even as owned by the Presbyterians themselves."—(Page 735.)

DEAN SHERLOCK (1641–1707) From this prominent divine Mr. Goode quotes the following paragraph, and adds a sentence from Dr. Claget to sustain it:

"I do allow Episcopacy to be an Apostolical institution, and the truly ancient and catholic government of the Church, of which more hereafter; but yet in this very book I prove indus-

triously and at large, that in *case of necessity*, when BISHOPS CANNOT BE HAD, a Church may be a truly Catholic Church, and such as we may and ought to communicate with, without Bishops, in vindication of some foreign Reformed Churches who have none; and therefore I do not make Episcopacy so absolutely necessary to Catholic communion as to unchurch all Churches which have it not." "The Church of England does not deny but that, in CASE OF NECESSITY, the ordination of Presbyters may be valid."

Here is the same ground taken as by all others. "Necessitas non habet legem."

BISHOP SHERLOCK (1678–1761), the still more distinguished bearer of this name, was a determined and able defender of the Church against the policy of those who, from evil design or mistaken charity, were disposed to make unlawful concessions. Of these the most active and least excusable was Benjamin Hoadley, who, for his services to the cause which they maintained, was, by the dominant party in Parliament, recommended for promotion, which Queen Anne would not give him. On the accession of George I., he was made Bishop of Bangor, and while holding that position, he preached (on March 31, 1717) a sermon before the King, on the nature of Christ's kingdom, in which he maintained principles at utter variance with the constitutions of all Christian Churches, especially such an one as his own.

For instance, he asserts that Christ hath left *no legislative and no executive power to his Church, or to any member thereof:* "no visible human authority," "no vice-regents," "no interpreters," "no judges."

He says:

"If such absolute authority be once lodged with men under the notion of *interpreters* [of the divine law or word], *they* then become *legislators*, and not Christ; and they rule in their own

kingdom, not in his."—(*Sermon*, 8vo. Ed., London, 1754, Vol. ii., p. 292.)

Levelling doctrines like these naturally enough called forth protests and replies, and so originated the famous "Bangorian Controversy." In this, Sherlock (then Dean of Chichester) was very active. In one of his tracts he writes thus of Hoadley:

"Has he written one sermon, nay one page to allay the fears of the people? Has he once declared his own concern for the Established Church? * * * * On the contrary, in a book written, as he says, for the service of the government, * * * he falls on the ministers of Christ as 'substituting themselves in His place, as assuming the authority of their great legislator and judge.' *He ridicules the Succession of the ministry* and regular ordinations as trifles, niceties, dreams, and inventions of men.*" * * * "Blown up with this success, his next step is to publish in the royal audience the same doctrines. He denies all power in the Church. He impeaches the Act of Uniformity and the Articles of the Church, and pleads for a removal of those negative discouragements which hurt nobody, and are meant only to secure the Church."—(*Works*, Vol. iv., p. 339.)

The Lower House of Convocation drew up a report, in which it was declared that the tendency of Hoadley's sermon, and his "Preservative," to which allusion is made in the extract just given, is

"To subvert all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, and to reduce his kingdom to a state of anarchy and confusion."

Sherlock was one of the Committee by which this Report was prepared.

In his sermon preached before the Sons of the Clergy at St. Paul's, in 1710, he says:

"The Apostles, on the death of our Saviour, succeeded to the

* The first direct adversary of Succession that we have met, was Tindal, the unbeliever; the second is one whom it was not uncommon to call a "Socinian in lawn." Whiston, in his Life, says of Hoadley, "He was a much better man before he was a Bishop. FOR SIX YEARS HE NEVER SAW HIS DIOCESE, but was employed in controversy."—(*Lathbury's History of Convocation*, p. 458.)

government and direction of the Church. They were commissioned to feed and rule the flock in his stead, and in his name. Under them were placed teachers and pastors of *different Orders*, who are comprehended [in the text] under the general name of Prophets. These offices have been perpetuated in the Church by a *constant Succession* of men duly called to them, and the present governors and pastors of it stand in the same degree of nearness and relation to Christ, that the Apostles did, who went before them in the same work of the ministry."—(Vol. iii., p. 281.)

WILLIAM LAW (1686–1761) was the greatest of all Hoadley's opponents. His celebrated letters are master-pieces of logical composition.

"If regularity of ordination, and *uninterrupted Succession* be mere trifles and nothing, then all the difference between us and other teachers must be nothing; for they can differ from us in no other respects. So that, my Lord, if Episcopal ordination derived from Christ, hath been contended for by the Church of England, your Lordship hath in this point deserted her; and you not only give up Episcopal ordination by ridiculing a Succession, but *likewise by the same argument exclude any minister on earth from having Christ's authority.* For if there be not a succession of persons authorized from Christ to send others to act in his name, then both Episcopal and Presbyterian teachers are equally usurpers, and as *mere laymen* as any at all." "If so, your Lordship's servant might ordain and baptize to as much purpose as your Lordship; for it could only be objected to such actions, that they had no authority from Christ. And if there be no Succession of ordainers from him, every one is equally qualified to ordain."

"My Lord, it is a plain and obvious truth, that no man or number of men, considered as such, can any more make a Priest or commission a person to officiate in Christ's name as such, than he can enlarge the means of grace, or add a new Sacrament for the conveyance of spiritual advantages."

"If there be no uninterrupted succession, then there are no authorized ministers from Christ, and if no such ministers, then no Christian Sacraments; if no Christian Sacraments, then no Christian Covenant, whereof the Sacraments are the stated and visible seals."—(*First Letter*, pp. 8–10.)

HUGH DAVIS, L.L.D., Fellow of New College, Oxford, (A. D. 1667):

"As to the Christian Church, * * and *the offices constituted in it by* DIVINE AUTHORITY, we have lighted upon the office of an Episcopos, Bishop or Overseer ecclesiastical of the affairs of it." "And he is the supreme supervisor in every ecclesiastical [matter], * * * and who, by virtue of this *institution of* CHRIST, * * * is bound to look after the affairs of the distinct societies of the Christian Church in general." — (*De Jure Uniformitatis Ecclesiasticæ.*)

BISHOP G. TOWERSON (died, 1697):

"Taking it, therefore, for granted, that as the Apostles were commissioned by our Saviour, so they were not wanting to commissionate others to succeed them in their power; nothing remains but to inquire in whose hands they did deposit it, which is so clear, both from Scripture and the story of the Church, to be in the hands of BISHOPS, and Priests, and Deacons, under them, that nothing but prejudice and faction could have given being to those schisms which late years have obliged us to behold. *For what other is it than Schism wittingly and willingly to depart from the obedience of those in whose hands the power of the Church was vested by them who had the plenitude thereof from its head,* CHRIST JESUS?"—(*On Catechism*, 2 Vols., fol., 1685, Vol. i., p. 303.)

DR. ADAM LITTLETON (1627–1694), Chaplain in Ordinary to the King. In his Sermon at Consecration of Bishop Fell, 1675, speaks thus:

"What the Apostles were in Christ's own time, that are the Bishops ever since, and what rank the seventy disciples held in the Church then, the same, and no other, do our ministers hold now." "*Ordination is so* PECULIARLY *the work of the* BISHOP *that Orders were* NEVER *otherwise bestowed than by his hands, and common Presbyters durst never attempt it, till within this little above a hundred years at Geneva.*"—(Works in folio, A. D. 1680, pages 288, 295.)

"There are two main branches of Episcopal power, visitation and ordination." * * * "Nor shall I dispute whether Bishops and Presbyters be *distinct* Orders or no; for the promiscuous use of the words in Scripture signifieth little, but the humility and condescension of superior officers in taking up the inferior's appellation, as St. Peter though an Apostle calls himself *Sympresbyteros* [their fellow Presbyter], and St. Paul goes lower, when he styles himself *Diakonos* [a Deacon]." "*Bishops are Presbyters, and something* MORE. *It does not follow e converso*

that all Presbyters are Bishops, therefore a parity!"—(Page 294.)

ARCHBISHOP WAKE (1657–1737).—This eminent and excellent man is quoted by Mr. Goode, but, as we believe, to little purpose. In his Exposition of the Doctrines of the English Church, he says:

"We confess that no man ought to exercise the ministerial office until he be first consecrated to it. *We believe that it is the* BISHOP'S *part* ONLY *to ordain. We maintain the distinction of the several Orders in the Church.*"—(*Article XV.*, quoted in *Tracts for Times*, ii., p. 153.)

After this, we are prepared to receive our author's extract, or the testimony he adduces. It is simply to the effect that the venerable Prelate had not such an iron heart as to excommunicate the Foreign Protestant Churches, or say, as some "furious writers" did, that they had *no* true and valid sacraments, or were scarcely Christian. Herein Wake exhibits just the same spirit that has been manifested by the greater number of our divines from the first: unwillingness to condemn those whose circumstances either did prevent their having a complete ministry, or were believed to have prevented it. There was *no recognition whatever of Presbyterian Churches as perfect*, but just the contrary; they are called *defective*. There was no acknowledgment of Presbyterian ordination, as such, but an allowance of *their* ordination as probably or really valid, under the circumstances.

DR. DANIEL WATERLAND (1683–1740), the celebrated Archdeacon of Middlesex.—It is not possible to read any of the writings of this able theologian, without being aware that he was a very decided believer in divine-right Episcopacy and Succession. It is not an easy matter, however, to find short passages

in which those doctrines are plainly affirmed. Here, however, is one all-sufficient in itself; it occurs in his second letter in reply to Mr. Kelsall's Answer:

"*As to rejecting the* PRETENDED ORDINATION *of* [or by] MERE PRESBYTERS, *the practice is consistent with the doctrine of our Church, and conformable to our twenty-third Canon.*"—(*Works*, Oxford ed., 1823, Vol. x., p. 184.)

JOHN JACQUES.—From his work entitled "Ordination by mere Presbyters proved Void and Null," 12mo., London, 1707, we take a few sentences:

"Our blessed Lord, as Supreme Governor of his Church, called and ordained his Apostles, and they ordained Deacons, Presbyters, and Bishops; but they gave the power of admitting all others only to the Bishops." "It is a plain demonstration that the holy Apostle did intend not only the Ordination, but the scrutiny and approbation of all ecclesiastical officers should be solely in the Bishop's power."

"The learned Daillé, the great patron of Presbyters, did acknowledge *Ordination in St. Cyprian's time was peculiarly the Bishop's right.* So that this confession of so great an adversary may excuse any further proof for that age."—(Pp. 6, 8.)

"All antiquity will not afford one instance of Presbyters making Ordinations without a Bishop. If any Presbyters did claim a right to ordain, and did presume against the rule of the Church in that particular, *the Church of those times did declare their Ordinations null.*" "Not only such as these, but all other irregular Ordinations have ever been accounted as NULLITIES."

"In the Council of Sardica those clerks that were ordained by Musæus and Eutychianus (who were not Bishops, but only two Grecian Presbyters) were reduced to the state and condition of laics. The like decree was made about the Ordinations of Maximus, a pretended but not real Bishop, that the persons should be reputed no clergymen, and all his acts annulled." He then goes on to cite the cases of Ischyras, and Colythus, and the Bishop of Agabra, and then concludes thus: All these "were accounted as nullities, though performed by those who were in sacred Orders."—(Pp. 18, 19.)

"Holy Scriptures do not afford one instance that mere Presbyters did ever admit [any] into the ministry by imposition of hands."

DR. WILLIAM SCLATER (died 1647).—Lord-Chancellor King, having in his youth written a book,

called an "Enquiry into the Constitution, etc., of the Primitive Church," it was answered by Sclater's "Original Draught;" which is said to have fully satisfied the inquirer. King argued for parity in Order:

"Though the Presbyters were thus different from the Bishops in degree, yet they were of the very same specific Order with them," etc., etc.—(8vo., London, 1843, p. 108.)

To this Sclater replies, by showing that in both the points included in his proposition the clear evidence of all Christian antiquity is against him. The judgment and practice of the primitive Church being opposed to his theory:

"It must follow, of course, that a Presbyter, in their times and in their opinion of him, *had not an inherent right by his Orders* to perform the whole office of a Bishop."—(P. 166, Oxford ed., 1840.)

He then goes on to show that Episcopal *rule*, and the *power of ordaining*, were never committed to Presbyters.

THOMAS STACKHOUSE.—From the well-known and elaborate Body of Divinity, published by this divine, we offer the following. Treating of the commission given by our Lord to His Apostles, he says:

"I send you to ordain your Successors." "As my Father sent me from his bosom with a full assurance of his love and paternal care, so I send you and YOUR SUCCESSORS, with the like promise of protection and assistance and success in your labors; for lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—(Fol., p. 732.)

"In the times of the Apostles there were THREE DISTINCT ORDERS of Ministers by whom the Christian Church was governed; and if we proceed in our inquiry an age or two farther, we shall find who the supreme governor in each Church was, cleared up beyond all controversy. Clemens Romanus, who wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians before St. John's death, reminds them, that before the late unhappy schism they walked in God's laws, being subject to their governors, i. e. their

Bishops or spiritual governors giving due honor to the Presbyters among them."

He then goes on to quote Ignatius, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, and Cyprian; and after these, says:

"*The farther we go the clearer the evidence both of the* SUCCESSION *and pre-eminence of* BISHOPS *appears.*"—(Fol., p. 742.)

"Whilst our Saviour lived on earth he reserved the power of ordaining Ministers to himself * * though he gave the Apostles and the seventy disciples a commission to preach, he never allowed them to communicate that commission to any other. Upon His removal the Apostles, who were the chief governors of the Church, ordained Ministers * * * * *After their demise, Ordination continued where they had left it, in Episcopal hands; nor do we find* ANY INSTANCE, EITHER IN SCRIPTURE OR ANTIQUITY, *of inferior Orders pretending to that prerogative.*"

ARCHBISHOP POTTER, of Canterbury (1674–1747):

"Since the *distinction of Bishops and Presbyters has been proved to have been of divine appointment*, it necessarily follows that *the power of Ordination*, which is the chief mark of this distinction, *was reserved to the* BISHOPS *by the same appointment.* Whence Ærius was reckoned among the heretics of his age, chiefly because he gave Presbyters power to ordain, and consequently made them equal to Bishops; which Epiphanius imputes to his ignorance of the Scriptures, and proves hence (as from an undoubted principle) that Bishops and Presbyters were NOT of the same Order, because PRESBYTERS HAD NOT POWER TO ORDAIN." * * * * "And St. Jerome himself (in the very place where he professedly endeavors to raise Presbyters as near to a parity with Bishops as he could) owns that Presbyters have not power to ordain. 'For what is it,' saith he, 'that a Bishop does which a Presbyter cannot do, *except ordination?*'"—(*On Church Government*, 12mo., 1711, p. 284.)

JOHN OLYFFE, in his "Practical Exposition of Church Catechism" (2 vols., 12mo., London, 1710), says:

"Thus there were in the seven Churches of Asia those who were called the Angels of the Churches, who had the power of government in them; and the neglect of that government, in some of them, is noted as their great fault." * * * "So that we may conclude that there were to be everywhere stated offi-

cers in the Churches that were fully settled, and that the office of teaching and governing the Church was committed unto them;" "and these officers were everywhere ordained and constituted *by those that had the power for it*, and were not to run of their own heads, nor till they were sent."—(Vol. i., p. 261.)

DR. THOMAS BISHOP also published in 1736 an Exposition of the Catechism, in which we find the following proof that members of the Church of England are also members of the Church Catholic:

"Because we hold the Head, the Lord Jesus Christ * * we are duly baptized unto his body. We accept his holy word as the only rule of our faith and practice; and we teach and maintain the same doctrine the primitive Church did, which doctrine was once delivered to the saints, and hath been held by the most ancient Fathers and Councils. We are built upon the same foundation, and submit to the same godly discipline, under *a regular, duly authorized, and* SUCCESSIVE MINISTRY from the Apostolical age."—(P. 172.)

ARCHDEACON WELCHMAN (born 1665, died 1735) published in 1713 his brief "Notes on the XXXIX Articles." He thus comments on the 23d:

"Since the ministers of the word and Sacraments are 'ambassadors of Christ' and 'ministers of God,' they must necessarily receive their authority from God, and be sent by Him; and must not assume that authority to themselves unless they are called to it by God. And since God, our Saviour, from the time when He called the Apostles, has not immediately called any one to the ministry, it follows that they must be called by those whose business it is to call others. Thus the Apostles ordained Presbyters and Bishops, and the Bishops ordained by the Apostles did thenceforth ordain others."—(Refers to Scripture, and to Clemens Romanus, *Hooker's Ecc. Polity, Potter on Church Government.*)

"We know that this power was granted ONLY *to the* BISHOPS from the age of the Apostles to the time of the Reformation; but that from thenceforward some Churches, who in *other things* were rightly reformed, have allowed it to Presbyters; whether justly or not, we leave it to themselves to consider. We neither judge nor despise them; but the case is *widely different* with our own countrymen, who, rebelling against an excellently well-constituted Church, *have arrogated to themselves the power of ordination.* These, therefore, we *rightfully* and *deservedly*

account guilty of schism and irregularity." — (Quotes Holy Scripture, Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Bishop Bilson, Bishop Hall, Hooker, Bishop Lloyd, Burscough, Scott's Christian Life, and Field of the Church.)

Dr. THOMAS BENNETT (1673–1720), a very learned divine of the same period, also wrote a sort of commentary on the Articles. For exposition of the 23d, he refers us to his work on "The Rights of the Clergy." Under the 36th, he says:

"*Because the validity of* OUR SUCCESSION *depends upon the validity of the prior ordinations, therefore we ought to satisfy ourselves concerning them.*"—(Page 160.)

In a separate work on Schism, he shows that it is "a deadly sin," that it exists in England; that the crime lay at the door of the Dissenters, and that the plea of agreement with us in fundamental doctrines would not excuse them, or free them from its guilt.

PHILIP SKELTON.—This "inimitable" preacher was born 1706, and died 1787:

"Nor did they [the Puritans, etc.] consider whether it was in the power of man to abolish at their discretion an order of the Church instituted by God himself." "Here again the scheme of our opponents was not to reform, but to destroy; and what was equally bold, to begin a new ministry with hardly any other mission than such as a number of men, and sometimes one man only, wholly unauthorized for aught that others could perceive, should assume. From men thus sending themselves, or sent by we know not whom, we are to receive the Sacraments!" * * * "Do we hear of any man in Scripture, who ordained himself, or presumed to take the ministry of God's word and Sacraments upon him without being sent, either immediately or *successively*, by Christ. Or can an instance of this nature be assigned during the first fourteen centuries of the Church. Or *will even those Protestants who adopted a new mission at the Reformation, now suffer any one to administer the Sacraments among them without ordination obtained in* SUCCESSION *from that adoption?*" "Do they not by this strictness practically confess at least the expediency of such a Succession?"

"So sacred a thing is the succession of ordination that the Holy Ghost, who had already enabled Barnabas and Paul to preach the word, ordered them to be separated for the work whereunto He had called them, by fasting, and prayer, and imposition of hands, that is, to be ordained. The Spirit of God hereby plainly showing that *He himself would not break the Successive order of mission established in the Church.*"—(*Works*, 6 vols., 8vo., London, 1824, Vol. iii., pp. 360, 361.)

BISHOP GEORGE HORNE of Norwich, born 1730, died 1792:

"These [the Gospel Ordinances] can no man minister to effect but by God's own appointment; at first by his immediate appointment, and *afterwards by* SUCCESSION and derivation from thence to the end of the world. Without this rule we are open to imposture, and can be sure of nothing; we cannot be sure that our ministry is effective, or that our Sacraments are realities. We are very sensible that the spirit of division will never admit this doctrine, yet the spirit of charity must never part with it. Writers and teachers who make it a point to give no offence, treat these things very tenderly, but he who in certain cases will give no offence to men, will, for that reason, give them no instruction." "We are informed that the liberties taken of late years against the ministry of the Church, have terminated in an attempt to begin a *spurious Episcopacy* in the American colonies." "Mr. Wesley when questioned about this fact in his lifetime, did not deny it, but pleaded NECESSITY to justify the measure. * * * A fatal precedent, if it should be followed. For if a Presbyter can consecrate a Bishop, we admit that a man may confer a power of which he is not himself possessed; instead of the less being blessed by the greater, the greater is blessed by the less, and the order of all things is inverted,"—(*Charge, Works*, Vol. ii., p. 570.)

BISHOP THOMAS WILSON (1663–1784) the Apostolical Bishop of Sodor and Man, speaks thus in his Sacra Privata:

"MARKS OF A TRUE PASTOR.—1. A lawful entrance upon motives which aim at the glory of God, and the good of souls. 2. An external call from the Apostolical authority of BISHOPS."

"BISHOPS.—A Bishop is a pastor set over other pastors. They were to ordain Elders. They might receive an accusation against an Elder. They were to charge them to preach such and such doctrines, to stop the mouths of deceivers, to set in order the things that were wanting; and lastly, *this was the form of Church*

government IN ALL AGES. So *that to reject this, is* TO REJECT AN ORDINANCE OF GOD."—(*Works*, Vol. ii., pp. 210–213.)

BISHOP NICHOLSON of Gloucester (1589–1671) thus defines the Catholic Church:

"A society of Christians dispersed unto all quarters of the world, who are united under Christ, their head; formalized and moved by His Spirit; matriculated by Baptism; nourished by His Word and Supper; *ruled and continued under* BISHOPS *and Pastors* lawfully called to these offices, *who succeed those upon whom the Holy Ghost came down*, and who have the power of the keys committed to them for administration of doctrine and discipline."—(*Exposit. Ch. Catechism*, Oxford, 1849, p. 70.)

JOSEPH BINGHAM (1708)—From the "Origines Ecclesiaticæ" of this profoundly learned and impartial writer, we obtain very positive evidence as to the views and practice of the Ancient Church, and of course his own opinions were not contrary to what his elaborate research had proved to be the Christian doctrine:

"The most ancient distinction that occurs is that of the superior clergy unto the THREE DISTINCT ORDERS of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons. That there were no other Orders in the Church but these three at first, will be evident in its proper place. * * * That Deacons were always a sacred and standing Order will be proved likewise when I speak particularly of them. Here, then, it remains that our inquiry be made only into the distinctions betwixt the Orders of Bishops and Presbyters. And this, so far as concerns matter of fact and the practice of the Church, * * * will be most fairly and fully resolved by considering only these three things: (1.) that the ancient writers of the Church always speak of these as *distinct Orders;* (2.) that they derive the original of Bishops from *Divine authority* and *Apostolical Constitution;* (3.) that they give us particular accounts and catalogues of such Bishops as were first settled and consecrated in the new founded Churches by the hands of the Apostles."

"But before I proceed to the proof of these things, I must premise one particular, to avoid all ambiguity that I take the word Order in that sense as the ancients use it, and *not as many of the Schoolmen do, who, for reasons of their own, distinguish between Order and jurisdiction, and make Bishops and Presbyters to be one and the same Order, only differing in power and*

jurisdiction. THIS DISTINCTION WAS UNKNOWN TO THE ANCIENTS, among whom the words Order, Degree, Office, Power, and Jurisdiction, when they speak of the superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, mean but one and the same thing."—(*Bohn's* ed., Imp., 8vo., 1856, Vol. i., pp. 17, 18.)

He then proceeds to show that each of the three Orders was divinely instituted, and that the powers and rights of each were accurately defined and strictly guarded. As to ordination, that of a Bishop was to be by other Bishops, three at least, to make it *regular* or *unquestionable.* That of a Presbyter, by the Bishop, sometimes the other Presbyters present signifying concurrence by some act. That of Deacons, by the Bishop only:

"There were other offices which were very rarely intrusted into the hands of Presbyters, and if ever they [the Bishops] granted them commission to perform them, it was only in case of great necessity; such were the offices of reconciling penitents, confirmation of neophytes," etc., etc. "But there was *one office which they* NEVER INTRUSTED *in the hands of* PRESBYTERS, *nor ever gave them any commission to perform, which was the* OFFICE OF ORDAINING *the superior Clergy, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.* The utmost that Presbyters could pretend to in this matter, was to lay on their hands, together with the Bishop, in the ordination of a Presbyter."—(Page 27.)

"But it may be enquired, what was the practice of the Church in case any Presbyters took upon them to ordain? Were their ordinations allowed to stand good, or not? I answer that they were commonly reversed and disannulled; as in the known case of Ischyras, who was deposed by the Synod of Alexandria because Coluthos who ordained him, was no more than a Presbyter, though pretending to be a Bishop. * * * And some other instances might be added of the like nature, which show that then they did not allow Bishops so much as to delegate or commission Presbyters to ordain in their name, *but reserved this entirely to the Episcopal function.*"—(Page 28.)

WILLIAM JONES, of Nayland:

"Jesus Christ was sent from Heaven by the Father, and invested with the glory of the priesthood by an actual consecration, when the Spirit descended upon Him. As the Father had sent Him, so did He send his disciples, and gave them

authority to send others; so that the Church which followed derived its authority from the Church which Christ first planted in the world; *and the Church, at this day, must derive its authority after the same manner, by* SUCCESSION *from the Church which went before; the line extending from Christ himself to the end of the world.*" — (*Essays on the Church*, London, 1852, p. 18.)

Mr. Jones gives as a footnote to the paragraph from which this sentence is taken, the following extract from Mr. Law's Second Letter to the Bishop of Bangor:

"Take away this Succession, and the clergy may be as well ordained by one person as another; *a number of women may as well give them a divine commission, but they are no more Priests of God than those who pretend to make them so.* If we had lost the Scriptures, it would be very well to make as good books as we could, and come as near them as possible; but then it would be *not only folly, but presumption, to call them the word of God.*"—(Page 19.)

Speaking of the first Christian Church, as founded at Jerusalem, he says:

"Here then we have THREE DISTINCT ORDERS of men, each distinct from the other; the twelve Apostles, the seventy Disciples, and the seven Deacons." * * * "In the Christian Church throughout the world we find these three Orders of Ministers for fifteen hundred years, without interruption. *The fact, therefore, is undeniable, that the Church has been governed by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, from the Apostles, downwards, and* WHERE WE FIND THESE ORDERS OF MINISTERS DULY APPOINTED, *the Word preached, and the Sacraments administered,* THERE *we find the Church of Christ with its form and its authority.*"—(Pages 19, 20.)

JOHN WESLEY (1703–1791):

"For more than twenty years this [separation] never entered into the thoughts of those that were called Methodists. But as more and more who had been brought up Dissenters joined with them, they brought in more and more prejudice against the Church. * * * Many had forgotten that we were all at our first setting out determined members of the Established Church."

"Nineteen years ago we considered this question in our public conference at Leeds, 'Whether the Methodists ought to

separate from the Church,' and after a long and candid inquiry, it was determined, *nemine contradicente*, that it was not expedient for them to separate. The reasons were set down at large, and they stand equally good at this day."

The venerable Preacher then goes on to meet the usual plausible objection of separatists, that the Church Clergy were not "holy," and therefore no blessing could follow their ministrations, and he shows that though the sons of Eli were wicked exceedingly, yet the Lord required his people to accept their services, because they were his Priests. And so, also, the Lord Jesus directed his disciples to attend the public services of Priests, who were utter hypocrites, for the same reason. In another Sermon he thus speaks to his preachers, who had not, at that time, assumed the full ministerial office:

"In 1744 all the Methodist Preachers had their first Conference. But none of them dreamed that the being called *to preach*, gave them *any right to administer the Sacraments*. * * * Did we ever appoint you to administer Sacraments; to exercise the priestly office? Such a design never entered into our minds; it was the farthest from our thoughts." — (*Sermons, American Edition*, Vol. ii., page 542.)

ROBERT CALDER. This Presbyter wrote a work on the Divine Right of Episcopacy. In 1788 he published, also, a small volume, entitled, "The Priesthood of the Old and New Testament, by Succession." In this work he establishes, at length, the proposition that the theory of Succession, which Mr. Goode and his followers think so "monstrous," was always recognized in the Church of God, and made *the test of lawfulness or validity of ministration*. As to the usage of the Christian Church, he quotes the Scriptures and the Fathers. From Irenæus, he takes the following:

"We must obey these Priests, who are in the Church, who have their Succession from the Apostles."—(*Lib.* iv. c. 43.)

His fourth letter commences thus:

"I have showed the necessity of lineal and uninterrupted succession to prove the validity of the ministerial function, and the great danger in the want of it, particularly that the administrations of such are null and void, because God hath not sent them." "Now I prove that Episcopal Presbyters and Deacons in Scotland, England, and Ireland, have Apostolical Ordination, and true mission from Bishops succeeding to one another, since the days of the Apostles."

"In the foresaid year (1662), Mr. Sharp, Mr. Leighton, Mr. Fairfoul, and Mr. Hamilton, were called up to London, and were there first ordained Deacons, afterwards Presbyters, and afterwards consecrated by Bishop Juxon." "It is certain that [then] several Presbyterians submitted to Episcopal Ordination, as Mr. Manton (Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell) was ordained in 1660, by Bishop Sydserf, being then at London. Mr. Calamy, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Fulwood, and Mr. Humphrey, received Episcopal Ordination, a long time after they had performed ministerial acts in the Presbyterian way." "*We find, also, that Mr. Richard Baxter received ordination from Bishop Hall, to put matters* BEYOND DOUBT."—(Pages 49–51.)

"It is observable that ordination, by mere Presbyters, was accounted a nullity in the ancient church."

Having mentioned the cases of Musæus, Eutychianus, Maximus, and Colythus, who being Presbyters, undertook to ordain, and had their acts declared presumptuous and void, he proceeds:

"The Council of Hispalis degraded a Priest, and two Deacons, because the Bishop of Agabra being affected with sore eyes, and having some presented to him, to be ordained Presbyters and Deacons, did only lay his hands upon them, suffering a Presbyter who stood by to say the prayers over them, and read the words of ordination."—(*Council Hispalis*, 2 *Canon* v.)

To the objection that the doctrines of Episcopacy and Succession "unchurches a great body of Protestants," to whom we ought to show more charity, he replies:

"It is not our charity, nor civility, nor the concessions of the learned, * * * that will make wrong right, or make them ministers who have not ordination by the divine rule of Apostolical Succession."—(Page 263.)

"That truth will be truth, let the professors be never so few, and a multitude can never make error to be truth." "Let, therefore, the Reformed Churches look to the consequences themselves, for as the Apostle says, 'We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.' * * * It is not our saying that Foreign Ministers are true ministers, that will make them so." (Page 150.)

"I offer another thought upon this head, the *unchurching*, etc., etc. If Presbyterians be right in this debate, and Episcopals wrong, *this will unchurch twenty thousand more Christians than the Foreign Churches are*, * * * there are three times more Christians in the world than Papists and Presbyterians are, and that under Episcopacy and Apostolical Succession."—(Page 153.)

BISHOP CLEAVER, of Chester (1791), in his directions to Student's in Divinity, indicates the following works as the proper sources of information on Church Polity, etc.: "Bennett's Answers to Dissenters," "The Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted (quoted on page 401)," "Hammond's works," "Hare's Sermons on Church Authority," "Jackson on Episcopacy," "Bishop Nicholson's Apology," "Olyffe's works," "Archbishop Potter on Church Government," etc., etc. This list shows clearly enough what was the teaching of that day upon the subjects we are considering.

BISHOP F. HARE. When Deacon of Worcester, in a work designed to expose the errors and evils of Hoadley's new policy, asks this question:

"I would be glad to know * * * whether Episcopacy was not, till, the 16th century, the UNIVERSALLY RECEIVED *and* UNINTERRUPTED FORM OF CHURCH GOVERNMENTS, *and whether, when a point has been* THOROUGHLY AND DEMONSTRATIVELY PROVED, *it may not be taken and spoken of as such?*—(*Reply to Bp. Hoadley.*)

ARCHDEACON BALGUY, speaking of the Church of England, says:

"It is the purest Church in Christendom." "It is formed on the model of primitive antiquity." "Its governors derive their authority by an uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles."

Having spoken of the "sects that were the numerous spawn of puritanism," he says:

"Far the greater part of these sectaries were implacable to those who differed from them, and the Presbyterian party, perhaps, more implacable than any other. *Had their Church retained its superiority and preserved its principles in their original force, our Reformation from Popery would have profitted us little; for neither was Popery more absurd in its doctrines, nor more severe in its discipline, nor in its spirit and temper more averse from toleration than the religion then professed by the main body of the Presbyterians.*"—(*Sermon preached* 1763, *in his Discourses and Charges*, London, 1817.)

BISHOP PORTEOUS, of London. In his Charge to his Clergy, A.D. 1794, this amiable prelate says:

"It becomes every day more important that you should take the utmost care respecting the character and conduct of those whom you thus employ [as curates or as *occasional assistants*]." "It is very properly and very wisely enjoined by the 48th Canon, that no curate, or minister, shall be permitted to serve in any Church, without the knowledge and license of the Diocesan, and with respect to those whom you may call in as occasional assistants, to perform any part of your duty it is indispensably necessary, and it is expressly ordered by the 50th and 52nd Canons, that you should suffer no stranger to officiate in your Church, without first requiring him to produce his license to preach."—(Vol. vi., p. 263.)

SAMUEL WIX. In his Illustrations of the XXXIX Articles, gives to the twenty-third and thirty-sixth interpretations in perfect harmony with the doctrines here maintained. *Ex. Gra.:*

"As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." "These words, uttered on the same occasion as that on which the prom-

ise was given, that Christ would be with his Apostles to the end of the world, plainly intimate to us a Succession of regular Ministers of God's Word, acting under the authority of Christ." "These Apostles would, therefore, (as we shall see they actually did), appoint Successors, whose business it would be to appoint others to succeed them in their sacred office, and with like authority to extend the line of succession to future generations."

"From this brief review of the order observed first by Christ, and afterwards by his Apostles, in appointing Ministers in his Church, it seems that *none are qualified to administer the Sacraments and preach the Word but they who can trace their authority from Christ.*"

"To the inquiry, then, who they are that have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard, it may be replied that THE BISHOPS *have this authority, acting in succession to the Apostles. And those Ministers ordained by* THEM *are they whom we ought to judge* LAWFULLY *called and sent into the Lord's vineyard.*—(pp. 217-220.)

VENEER. In his work on the Articles, takes precisely the same ground as the other commentators we have quoted:

"Our adversaries have been challenged long since to produce an ordination, during the first 1500 years after Christ, which was performed by Presbyters and not generally looked upon as invalid, whereas, on the other hand, *they who have been ordained by mere Presbyters in the primitive times, have been stripped of their* PRETENDED *orders, and with derision turned down to the laic form.*—(*On 23d Article, quoted in Tomline.*)

BISHOP SKINNER, Primus of the Scottish Episcopal Church:

"As the 23d Article is sufficient to show the necessity of such a lawful commission, so the 36th Article plainly declares that the persons invested with such commission are the Bishops, Priests and Deacons who are duly consecrated and ordered according to the rites of the Book referred to in that Article, and in which Book the Church of England, by her prayers to Almighty God, acknowledges her belief that every one of these Orders was appointed by his Holy Spirit, and, therefore, was certainly of divine institution.—(*Truth and Order*, p. 132.)

BISHOP TOMLINE, of Winchester, has been referred

to by Mr. Goode as favoring his view.* Tomline says, however, without a particle of doubt or hesitation, that the parties who have authority in the Congregation or Church of Christ to call and send laborers into the Lord's vineyard, are the Bishops.

"It appears, then, that no species of Church government except the Episcopal, and no mode of ordination except by Bishops have any claim to the sanction of the primitive Church of Christ." "*In every Church in which Episcopacy prevails, the* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION OF THE BISHOPS *is considered as* ESSENTIAL *to the power of ordaining and consecrating.* And upon that principle, when, a few years since, Episcopacy was about to be established in the independent States of America, the persons who were to be appointed * * * to be the first Bishops, previously came from America to receive consecration from the hands of English Bishops. And upon the same principle, we should allow a popish Priest, who should have renounced the errors of popery, to perform the functions of a Priest in our Church without a fresh ordination."—(*On 23d Article, Theology,* pp. 536–7.)

ARCHDEACON DAUBENY (1744–1827).—This faithful and able advocate of Church principles received for his "Guide to the Church," "Vindiciæ," &c., &c., the thanks and commendation of such men as Jones of Nayland, Bishop Fisher, and Archbishop Howley. Few men have written controversial works with such gentlemanly and Christian courtesy, or with such a happy union of the *suaviter in modo et fortiter in re,* as this devoted Presbyter, whose zeal and princely munificence made him a blessing and an honor to the Church.

* On his 70th page, Mr. Goode quotes a paragraph from Tomline, which was evidently moulded upon those passages in the works of Bacon and Whitgift, which have already been explained. He uses the word "government" in the same comprehensive sense that they did. He says it is not necessary that *all* things connected with it should be "precisely the same in every Christian country." He also says, "I readily acknowledge that there is no PRECEPT in the New Testament which COMMANDS that every Church should be governed by Bishops." Such statements, though unguardedly made, may pass unchallenged.

Speaking of the Preface to the Ordinal, he says:

"On this supposed unquestionable ground, established by historical proof, of the uniformity of the Ecclesiastical Constitution for a long succession of ages, the Church of England has proceeded with confidence in her judgment on this most important subject. Hence it is, that in her Canons she *exclusively* appropriates the title of a *true and lawful Church* to that society of Christians in this country assembled under Episcopal Government, and determines all separatists from it to be schismatics."—(*London Ed.*, 2 vols., 8vo., 1830, vol i., p. 8.)

"The strength of the argument in defence of the Apostolical Government of the Church lies in this undoubted truth, that the Christian Priesthood is a divine institution, which, as it could have no beginning but from God, so neither could it be continued but in the way appointed by God for that purpose. * * * The Ministry of reconciliation was committed by Christ to his Apostles; and that Ministry was confessedly branched out to them into THREE DISTINCT ORDERS, distinguished from each other by the appropriate titles of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon."—(P. 13.)

And having shown that the polity of the Christian Church had always, for fifteen centuries, been, "in the true sense of the word, EPISCOPAL," he proceeds:

"This argument, three centuries ago, would have been unanswerable; but since men thought proper to depart from the Government of the primitive Church and to erect a new platform of Church discipline, it has become necessary that their reasoning should correspond with their practice." * * * "Those foreign Reformers who were the first establishers of a new form of Government in the Church pleaded *necessity* for their conduct. "It is not our business to examine the justice of that plea, but, in candor, to admit it. We therefore say for them what on this occasion they said for themselves—that they considered it a most unjust aspersion of their character to say that they were *anti*-Episcopalians, or that they condemned or threw off Episcopacy *as such*; on the contrary, they lamented their unhappy circumstances" * * * considering their want of Episcopacy to be more their misfortune than their fault. Such was at the time the declared language of Calvin and Beza.—(Pp. 14, 15.)

"Ignorance * * * is well known to be one general cause of separation from the Church. Let it be an object with the Clergy, then, to remove that ignorance with respect to the Church, by bringing their people so acquainted with its nature

and the design of its establishment, that they may feel it to be their duty to continue members of it. Whilst they are suffered to remain uninformed upon this subject the preservation of Christian unity is not to be expected."

"The people must not only be taught that it is their duty to live in communion with the Church; they must, moreover, be satisfied that they shall be profited by that communion."

On this point he quotes this from Archbishop Sharpe:

"This I am sure of—so long as you continue in our communion you are in the communion of the Church of Christ. *I dare answer for the salvation of all those who continuing in our Church live up to the principles of it.* But I dare answer nothing for them who being brought up in this Church, and having so great opportunities given them of knowing the truth, do yet depart from it. I pray God they may be able to answer for themselves."—(Pp. 361–3.)

We may add that though the conductors of the Christian Observer often differed with the venerable Archdeacon, yet, in their fourth volume (p. 180), they commend him for his advocacy of Episcopacy in the "Guide to the Church," from which we have made these extracts.

BISHOP S. HORSLEY. Says, in his charge of 1790:

"Dissenters are to be judged with much candor, and with every possible allowance for the prejudices of education. But for those who have been nurtured in the bosom of the Church and have gained admission to the Ministry, [if] from a mean compliance with the humor of the age, or ambitious of the fame of *liberality of sentiment* (for under that specious name a profane indifference is made to pass for an accomplishment), they affect to join in the disavowal of the authority which they share, or are silent when the validity of their divine commission is called in question—for any (I hope they are few) who hide this weakness of faith, this poverty of religious principle under the attire of a gown and cassock; they are, in my estimation, little better than infidels in masquerade."—(p. 31.)

DR. THOMAS G. TAYLOR:

"It is not enough that the doctrines and services of our Church are pure and Apostolical; there must be a divine commission,

or there can be no authority to command obedience, no sanction to secure the promises." "An outward commission, mediately or immediately from God, is requisite to authorize a man to execute any sacerdotal act of religion, is evident from the word of Scripture and the example of our Saviour and his Apostles."

"Of those who were regularly ordained there were regular Orders and Degrees, each invested with the powers that were proper to their respective offices, and neither [of them] suffered to interfere in the peculiar functions of their superior Order." "Whatever cavils may have been made concerning the names of Bishop and Presbyter being sometimes applied in common, it cannot be doubted that there were Ministers in the Church of a superior Order to the Presbyters and Deacons, as long as the Epistles of St. Paul * * * exist, containing directions for the governing of those Orders. And in the very next age we have the concurrent testimony of antiquity, confirming the institution of this superior Order, and appropriating to the Ministers of that Order the title of Bishops."

"It must certainly be a chief recommendation of any church that it preserves the institutions and primitive ordinances of the Apostles in their greatest purity. But it is moreover *essential to the* VALIDITY of the ministerial functions, that the divine commission be regularly transmitted in the way of Apostolic institution." — ("*Why I am a Churchman.*" Published by S. P. C. K.)

BISHOP MANT, of Down, Connor and Dromore:

"If Schism or an unreasonable separation from the Church be in itself sinful, it is sinful at one time as well as another, as well when the Church is under the government of the legitimate Successors of the Apostles as when it was under the government of the Apostles themselves." — (*Sermons*, vol. ii., p. 295.)

He then goes on to inquire as to the means of grace and the parties who are empowered to administer them, and with whom, therefore, it is the bounden duty of every Christian to remain in communion, and comes to this conclusion:

"The Apostles, who were themselves holy men and full of the Holy Ghost, did send other persons, to whom they gave power and authority to send others, *through whom the office of Ministers of the Gospel has been handed down in* REGULAR AND UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION *from the Apostles* to the present

time. And hence we perceive who are the persons with whom our Saviour promised he would be "always, even unto the end of the world"—namely, those persons who should be employed in the administration of the means of grace provided in the Gospel, *by a commission derived regularly from the Apostles, and through the Apostles from Himself.*"—(P. 320.)

In another place he says:

"It may inoffensively be said, that under the Episcopal form, regularly transmitted by Succession from the Apostles, together with the Apostles' doctrine, is to be found the Apostles' fellowship—that there, if anywhere, may be confidently expected the sanctifying influences of the Comforter—that there, if anywhere, may be enjoyed the perpetual presence of the Divine Founder of the Church."

The Christian Observer—the great Evangelical standard—comments thus on the passage just quoted, and its context:

"We heartily concur in the Right Reverend author's remark, that *greatly as we have reason to thank God for having by his good providence established among us a pure Episcopal Church, the value of the Episcopal office is altogether distinct from any privilege it enjoys, as sanctioned by the laws of the land.*"

DR. T. WAITE, published, in 1826, his Discourses on the XXXIX Articles, from which we quote a few sentences:

"Thus [i. e. by the Apostles] was that Order of Bishops, Priests and Deacons established, which continued in UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION for fifteen hundred years in all Christian Churches, and still subsists in our own."—(P. 336. *On 23d Article.*)

"This authority had its origin, not with Popery, as some imagine, but with the Apostles. An Episcopal Church existed in England long before the name of the Pope was known in the island. And though the British Church afterwards partook of the corruptions of that of Rome, yet its succession of Bishops continued unbroken. Though its ministrations were corrupted yet its authority was not destroyed. Its right of ordination was no more affected by the Romish errors and superstitions, than a person's title to his inheritance is injured by the vices and depravity of his ancestors. The Reformation restored our Church to its primitive purity, delivered it from the spiritual

tyranny of the Roman pontiff and rescued it from a load of superstitious notions and practices under which true religion seemed to be sinking. It preserved, also, the ecclesiastical Orders which the Church received from the Apostles, and transmitted them unimpaired to us. Whatever, then, may be the case with other Churches, *of the validity of our ministrations there can be no doubt they are the Ordinances of Christ, which he has promised to be with, to prosper, and to bless unto the end of time.*"

"The authority of the governors of the Church being admitted, *those* ONLY *are to be considered as lawfully called and sent, who are* ORDAINED *to the office of the ministry* BY THEM."—(Page 339.)

Dr. Waite thinks the framers of the Article omitted from it, in tenderness to those "whom they wished to reconcile," any definite statement as to the parties having lawful authority to ordain, and says it becomes us to imitate their moderation. We are perfectly willing to do so, as far at least as he has done himself. But we recognize no such tenderness, or "desire to avoid giving offence;" for if the honest avowal of belief on such a matter would be offensive, they have made it in another place. There certainly could be no great anxiety (from any such motive) to keep out of one page what they print openly on the next. There is altogether too much said on the subject of our formularies not "impugning the ordination of other Churches." Expressly by name and by anathema they do not indeed; but by direct and unavoidable inference they do; unless, indeed, it can be shown that the Church of Christ can be divided, and yet united — many and one — Episcopal and Presbyterian at the same time! If it can be shown that two forms of polity entirely different, and opposite in their character, are both sanctioned, or both established in Holy Scripture, then proving the authority of one, will not necessarily involve the

condemnation of the other; but if nothing of the kind can be shown, *then every testimony in favor of Apostolical Episcopacy is a testimony directly against Popery, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, and every other system.* That this is the fact is shown by Waite himself; for immediately after eulogizing the Church's supposed tenderness in not impugning the validity of other ordinations, he proceeds to prove that "no ministry can be valid," which is not derived from Jesus Christ, either mediately or immediately, and that in this age it can only be found among those who have received it in direct Succession.

EDWARD BICKERSTETH [On Articles]. In proof of the doctrine that no one must invade the ministerial office, this writer refers to "the cases of Korah Dathan, and Abiram, of Saul, and of Uzziah, all of whom committed a great trespass in presuming to minister in holy things, without being lawfully called." He then goes on to inquire about the Constitution of the Church, supplying answers to his own questions. We will give some of the replies:

"In the Jewish Church there was a *threefold* ministry, that of High Priest, Priests, and Levites, corresponding to the THREE ORDERS of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." In the Christian Church, as founded by the Apostles, "there were two gradations of inferior Orders, one higher than the other; and there was *a third Order superior to them both*, WITH POWER TO ORDAIN THE TWO INFERIOR ORDERS, *and to take the general oversight of them, and of the Church.*"

After the death of the Apostles, they were succeeded by those to whom exclusively the name of Bishops was given, and to this effect Mr. Bickersteth quotes the following:

"Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first insti-

tution of Bishops was from Heaven, was even of God, the Holy Ghost was the author of it."—(*Hooker.*)

"THE BISHOPS ARE THE LAWFUL SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES *and inheritors of their power.*"—(*Sanderson.*)

As to the authority for any other than the Episcopal mode of government, he quotes Hooker's well known challenge, and upon Presbyterian Ordination, gives this from the same great authority:

"No man is able to show either Deacon or Presbyter ordained by Presbyters only, and his ordination accounted lawful in any ancient part of the Church."

HENRY MELVILLE, probably the greatest Preacher of the English Church in this age, shall be our next witness. Speaking of the authority to ordain, and to exercise the ordinary work of the ministry, he says:

"From the Bishops ordained by the Apostles, we are ready to prove by a series of historical documents, that our Bishops derive their authority to ordain ministers, a point which, however, lost sight of, or ridiculed in a day when men think no authority necessary, provided they have a little turn for public speaking, * * * this point, we say of the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, of the ministry of our Church is one of the weightiest that can be agitated in a Christian community. I could as soon believe that Christ is not the head of his Church, as believe that He has made no provision for a Succession of ordained ministers; and unless this provision be found in an Episcopal Order, my firm conviction is that it exists not on the broad face of the earth."—(*Sermons*, Vol. iii., p. 265.)

THEOPHILUS GIRDLESTONE, treating of Schism, says:

"It is a separation of the members of the body of Christ, from each other, and by consequence from the common head of all, and since this separation takes place in opposition to the will and design of our Lord, it is an act of direct disobedience towards Him, and of resistance to his supreme authority; for if He requires that all his people should worship Him with one mouth, 'being perfect, joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment,' it must needs be *exceeding sinful*

to separate them into divers places and modes of worship, * * * and a wide difference of doctrine."

"It is plain that if every society of professing Christians is entitled to call itself the Church of Christ, then his Church consists of as many separate societies holding all shades and degrees of opinion as there are vain and fanciful men to strike out new forms of doctrine; there can be no established system of government, no uniformity of teaching, no communion in worship; and it is in the power of any private individual to erect a NEW CHURCH OF CHRIST, *or even to be a Church by himself!* Upon this supposition certainly there could be *no* separation from the Church, and no such offence as Schism."

"If we could suppose the Apostles and the primitive Bishops to see the present state of the Christian world, what words could be found to express their astonishment, alarm, and indignation, at the scene which it presents; the contempt for lawful authority; the endless varieties of doctrine; the needless divisions into sects and parties; *the assumption of the ministerial office by men either unordained, or ordained by persons with no better title than themselves;* the indifference with which these flagrant violations of our Lord's prerogative are generally regarded, *and the ignorance which prevails respecting the nature of the Church, and* THE DUE SUCCESSION OF ITS BISHOPS AND MINISTERS, BY APOSTOLICAL ORDINATION? All these signs of the times would have filled those pious men with horror, and made them to doubt whether the Church of Christ had not ceased to exist!" "I feel bound to declare to you my conscientious conviction that the Church under the government of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, is the only Church of Christ, and that all other societies of Christians can only be regarded as separations from it, in contradiction to the plan formed by the Apostles under the direction of their Divine Master."—(*Lectures on Catechism.*)

WM. ARCHER BUTLER, Professor T.C.D. It is impossible to mention the name of this great and gifted divine without a feeling of melancholy. Surely, the removal of such a man, in the very vigor of youth, is one of the strangest mysteries of Providence. But it was the work of Him who doeth all things well!

In the first volume of his sermons, one will be found, which we earnestly wish were not only read

but *studied* by every Minister of the Church. It is on the union of Church principles with Christian sympathy. We believe there has been nothing so admirable put forth on this subject since the days of Hooker or Bishop Hall. After treating of the misrepresentations of outsiders, and the extreme views of partisans, the Professor announces it as his wish:

"To tranquilize the fears of those who conceive, either that if they accept as obligatory the primitive system of the Church, they must avoid every form and degree of spiritual recognition towards those who have lost it; or that since they cannot accept the *extravagant* theory which places the pious Presbyterian and Congregationalist on a level with the heathen, *they must, of necessity, surrender all the* EXCLUSIVE *claims of the ancient Episcopal Ministry.*"

"The positions, then, which I consider that we, as the duly commissioned Ministers of this Church, are justified in maintaining, are these:

1. The great general principle, that the Apostleship of Jesus Christ is still and forever in the world; as really in all the substance of the office as when it was held under circumstantial differences of miraculous attestation by Peter, and James, and John. That as breathing the breath of natural life into the first man, He gave him, by a single act, a power thenceforward physically transmissive through the whole immense series of the human race, so, * * * breathing on them the Holy Ghost, He conferred, once for all, a spiritual power analogously transmissive to innumerable Successors. * * * That it therefore becomes the same violation of his appointed order * * * to separate, under any pretext of sanctity, from this Succession without a palpable corruption of doctrine * * * as it would for holy men during the actual Ministry of the Apostles, to have neglected all communion with them."

2. That this general conception of a perpetual Apostolate * * * is manifestly confirmed by the *fact* of the organization of the Apostolic Churches, both laity and Ministers, under individual Governors, *exercising* EXCLUSIVE *power of ordination and spiritual superintendence.*"

3. That the DIVINE AND EXCLUSIVE AUTHORITY of this Constitution is consistent with the strong *probability* that where it should be lost, the mercy of God would not suffer that unhappy error to prevent the gift of His graces to those who sincerely sought them."

He then goes on to speak of *real, undeniable holiness* existing in some who are yet outside of the Church as regularly and fully constituted, and the usefulness of some as Gospel Preachers who are not validly ordained:

"It is wrong to affirm that the hearers of such *uncommissioned* persons must be left to the extraordinary [or uncovenanted] mercies of God."

"It is quite possible to consider the Apostolic Constitution of the Church as the *established dispensation of the means of grace*, and to regard *adherence to that Constitution as a* PEREMPTORY AND PERPETUAL DUTY, and yet to recognize the reality of its occasional degradation, the independency of divine grace on its necessary instrumentality, and the benefits that have been attained beyond its verge."

"But it may probably be urged that all these concessions are not sufficient, unless we admit within the circle of *The Church itself* the various forms of associations which have been made the means of grace to believers in Christ; that is, unless we include within our conception of the Church, every existing or possible social organization for the preaching of the Gospel. And it is supposed that unless this admission be made, it will still be necessary to exclude many of the holiest disciples of Christ from that sole claim to eternal happiness which is founded in being members of His mystical body. But there need not arise any very perplexing difficulty on this point. We are not forced, in order to save the pious Dissenter, to make his *irregular Society* an integral part of the mystical body of Christ. The mercy of God secures his salvation, when he is to be saved, on deeper grounds than this."

BISHOP HAROLD BROWNE. The learned Bishop of Ely, now exercising his high office, thus treats of our subject in his most elaborate and admirable Exposition of the XXXIX Articles:

"It is the plain record of all antiquity, that Ordination was anciently conferred by the highest Order of the Ministry. This will probably be questioned by no one. We have seen that St. Clement, the earliest Christian writer, except those of the New Testament, speaks of the Apostles as having appointed Successors to themselves in the Ministry and Government of the Church. We have seen that Irenæus speaks of a regular Succession from the Apostles in the Churches, and that he counts

up the Succession in the Churches of Rome and Smyrna. A like testimony we have brought from Tertullian. The farther we proceed, the clearer the evidence becomes that NO ORDINATIONS TOOK PLACE, EXCEPT OF THOSE WHO THUS SUCCEEDED TO THE MINISTRY OF THE APOSTLES, *deriving their Orders in direct Succession from them.*

"THERE IS NO EXAMPLE OF ORDINATION EVER BEING ENTRUSTED TO PRESBYTERS ONLY."

"Those who advocate the parity of Bishops and Presbyters appeal to the language of St. Chrysostom and St. Jerome, who undoubtedly maintained with great earnestness the dignity of the office of Presbyter, and esteemed it very little inferior to the Episcopate. Yet their very words shew distinctly that in ONE POINT, *and that the very point now in question, the Bishop had a power not entrusted to the Presbyter.* St. Chrysostom says that 'Bishops excel Presbyters *only in the power of Ordination,*' and St. Jerome asks, 'What does a Bishop that a Presbyter does not, *except ordaining?*'"

"Other Presbyters equally with him [the Bishop] received authority to teach, to baptize, to minister the Eucharist; but HE, ONLY, HAD AUTHORITY TO ORDAIN. Such authority was believed to have been derived to Bishops from the Apostles. And the principle upon which their Ordinations were deemed valid was not merely that they themselves had the priestly office, but that they had received authority (by regular Episcopal descent) to give Ordination and Mission to others."

"Those who maintain the validity of Presbyterian Orders, do so on the ground that Bishops were themselves but Presbyters. Those who maintain that Episcopal Ordination is necessary reply, that even though Bishops be themselves Presbyters, yet they only, and not all Presbyters alike, had the authority to ordain, and, therefore, that WITHOUT THEM ORDINATION COULD NOT TAKE PLACE.

"In the English Church the primitive rule of Episcopal Ordination and Apostolical descent has never been infringed." —(*On 23d Article.*)

As to the supposed "carefulness" of the Reformers, so to word this Article as "not to exclude" those who maintain Presbyterian Ordination, or upon the supposed ambiguity of its language, Bishop Browne says:

"The ambiguity is not real, but apparent only, as it is not only clearly stated that not all who are themselves Ministers

can ordain, but only those invested with public authority in the Church to send others into the vineyard. THIS IS A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF A BISHOP."—(*Ibid.*, p. 557.)

Here, then, we close our Catena. It begins, as of right, with Cranmer—it ends with a Bishop yet alive. In the three hundred and twenty years between those two, every successive period has been represented in it. We have given fairly, and as fully as our limits would admit, the opinions of every divine whose name is famous, who has written upon the subject we are considering, and whose works are procurable in this country. What, then, is the result? Do they give an uncertain sound? Do they not, one and all, declare themselves believers in Episcopacy, *jure divino*, and in Apostolical Succession? Do they not, one and all, re-echo the VOICE OF THE CHURCH. We find, of course, some differences in minor matters. Thus, we see Bishops Hall and Davenant agreeing with Andrews and Cosin in giving to Foreign Churches the benefit of the plea advanced by their founders, while Hicks, Jacques, Calder, and others are unwilling to confess that there ever was any such necessity as could justify a departure from the regular and Scriptural mode of governing the Church and commissioning its ministers. Other differences, also, may be perceived; but as to the chief points—those that are DISTINCTIVE PRINCIPLES of OUR CHURCH, we have here presented, as we believe, evidence of a greater concord than can be found to exist on any other topic of the sort, or than any Catena has ever produced. And this we set forth as an honest and proper chain of evidence. It is no partial or meagre list, like what we sometimes see

put forward to serve a weak cause. We can conceive nothing more false or absurd than to offer as a Catena a list of Anglican divines in which the names of Jeremy Taylor, Bishop Bull, Leslie, Law, Waterland and Jones would not appear. They are not to be found in Mr. Goode's book; but they are here—and on the subject of debate, their judgment is *one and the same.* Concordant among themselves, they are one in opinion with all the rest who here bear their open testimony.

And what appears on the other side? A few extracts from prominent divines, brought forward to prove that they were the very opposite of what history and their own writings show that they were—a series of extracts, sometimes questionable, often garbled or misapplied, or, if fairly given, containing only charitable expressions, or statements of what might be lawful in cases of NECESSITY. AND THAT IS ALL!

What one, even of Mr. Goode's authorities, ventures to say out boldly that Presbyterian Ordination, as such, is valid. NOT ONE! If any of his own witnesses sanction the Orders of the Foreign Episcopal Churches, it is only on the ground of their alleged NECESSITY. Not one of them has a single word to say in favor of Presbyterian Ordination, as it was found in England, and is found here in America. Even Burnet himself declares that *it is quite out of all rule, and could not be done* WITHOUT A VERY GREAT SIN *unless the* NECESSITY *were great and apparent.*" The only sentiment we remember that approaches the character of a direct acknowledgment of Pres-

byterian Orders as such, is this: "Seeing a Presbyter is equal to a Bishop in the power of Order, *he hath equally intrinsical power to give Orders.*" But, unfortunately for Mr. Goode's cause, this was not written by the great Episcopal divine to whom it is attributed, but by the *Scotch Presbyterian Minister who forged his name, twenty years after his death!*

CHAPTER XII.

AMERICAN DIVINES.

WE must study brevity in this Chapter. Its only purpose is to show that the judgment of the American Clergy upon the subject before us has been always in accordance with that of their English brethren. And this may be done without going to any great length:

BISHOP SEABURY (1728–1796):

"The authority under which the Apostles acted being derived from Christ, in the exercise of it they were *his* ministers, because the authority was originally and properly his, and they could act only in his name; and this authority being by *successive ordinations, continued down to this day, all duly authorized Clergymen now act by it*, and are, therefore, the ministers of Christ."

"It remains then that there is *no other way left to obtain a* VALID *commission to act as Christ's minister in his Church, but by an* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION *of ordinations from the Apostles.*"—(*Sermons, Edition of* 1815, Vol. i., pages 9–23.)

BISHOP WHITE (1747–1836) must be quoted a little more at length, owing to the common misrepresentation of his views. Concerning the 36th Article, and the Ordinal, which it endorses, he says:

"This is another Article of our Church, which has been much applauded for its *liberality*, and at the same time not with a friendly design; *it being done to lead to the inference that in framing the Articles of the Church of England* (of which ours is a copy, with accomodation to local circumstances), *no*

more was intended than to offer an apology for the difference between Episcopacy and Presbytery on the ground of human institution, not in itself sinful. This is an ENTIRE MISCONCEPTION of the *enlightened views of the English Reformers,* * * * in laying down Articles of faith, they had no design of condemning other Protestant Churches on a point of discipline. While yet being governed in practice by their own sense of the *original difference between the two higher Orders of the Ministry, they have precisely marked it in the preface,* and in some of the devotions of the Ordinal. These being the subject of the Article must be supposed to assist in the interpretation of it."

"An express tendency to this effect presents itself to our notice in the first sentence of the preface, which says: 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these THREE ORDERS of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.' Here is an appeal to Scripture for the discrimination of Order in the time of the Apostles, and to ancient authors for its prevailing from that time downward. *Evidently the framers of this preface knew of no deviations from the original institution,* until the then recent times immediately subsequent to the Reformation." "Consistent with this are three prayers in the three several services for the ordaining of Deacons, the ordaining of Priests, and for the consecration of a Bishop. Each of the forms acknowledges that by DIVINE APPOINTMENT *there are* DIVERS ORDERS *of Ministers in the Church,* and then prays [for each in turn]." "There could hardly have been a more significant declaration that *each of the noticed Orders made a distinct branch of the original Constitution of the Church,* and the sentiments derives an immense increase of solemnity from its being made in an appeal to Almighty God."—(*Lectures on Catechism,* pages 157, 158.)

Again, on the page last quoted, the good Bishop expressly maintains that the ministry of the Christian Church is of *Divine institution,* and that as established "*by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, it includes the three Orders* of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." That the ministry is of Divine institution, he says is to be maintained against enthusiasts who claim to do without any external commission:

"*In opposition to these we affirm the* NECESSITY of SUCCESSION FROM THE APOSTLES. The commission from them was by a

personal act, performed on those whom they admitted in the beginning to a co-partnership with them in their authority and their labors. But it is evident that *Succession* is the only way in which there could have been a transmission of the same from age to age."—(*Ibid.*)

"So far as the practice of early Churches is concerned, it goes directly to the same point. *There not having been any Church in which the ministry was not supposed to be fenced round by* DIVINE APPOINTMENT, *and to have been handed down in* SUCCESSION FROM THE APOSTLES."

"The anti-Episcopalians concede that during the lives of the Apostles there were two Orders, one of whom were those holy men themselves, and the other were an Order subordinate to them, which were called by two Greek words, which are translated Bishops and Presbyters, names designating the same office. That the two terms were thus indiscriminately applied, is a matter conceded by Episcopalians. But they say that the *general superintendence of the Church, and the power of ordination*, were NEVER *committed to that Order*, but remained in the Apostles, and in persons whom they associated with themselves, with a view to those higher ends."—(Page 170.)

As to the question whether the Episcopacy be "obligatory, like the Sacraments, at all times and under all circumstances of the Church," he says:

"If the moving of this question had originated in the mere rage for innovation, it would be hardly worth the resolving, at the expense of the danger of disparaging an institution made venerable by Apostolic origin, and by the uninterrupted usage of fifteen centuries. But it happened at the Reformation that in some countries Christians were so circumstanced as that *they had no alternative between dispensing with this particular regimen, and continuing in the bosom of a Church extremely corrupt in doctrine;* and UNDER THIS EMBARRASSMENT many ecclesiastical systems were established without the requisition of Episcopal Ordination."—(P. 173.)

The Bishop thought the English Reformers were specially considerate in judging of the Foreign Churches, owing to this NECESSITY. He says the Church of England

"*Decidedly set her feet on the ground of the Apostolical origin of Episcopacy*, [yet] she carefully avoided passing a judgment

on the validity of the ministry of other Churches, or determining in any shape on the question last proposed."

On this we must remark, as we have done more than once, that if it means that the English Church refrained from open denunciation or anathema, preserving a charitable silence as to the points in which the Continental Protestants professed themselves obliged to differ, it is all perfectly correct; but if it means that the Anglican Reformers did not hold to the divine right of Episcopacy, with all the legitimate consequences of that theory, or that they did not avow it, and *act upon it constantly*, it is entirely wrong; and the good Bishop himself has proved it so. He excuses the Foreign Protestant Churches, on the score of necessity, but says expressly, that "the effects of this are to continue no longer than the crisis which gave occasion to them."

Of the opinions held by Dr. Smith, Bishop Claggett, and Bishop Jarvis we have given proof elsewhere.

BISHOP BENJAMIN MOORE, of New York (consecrated 1801):

"When this pure and undefiled religion was established upon earth by Christ and his holy Apostles, every necessary provision was made to secure the continuance of it to the end of the world. *Its Ministers were solemnly ordained, and the mode of perpetuating the Succession was pointed out;* its sacred ordinances were instituted, and the regular administration of them in all succeeding ages clearly enjoined."—(*Sermons*, vol. i., p. 346.)

"Just at the conclusion of the Apostolic age, these three Orders received the distinguished appellation of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, which have continued through all succeeding ages to the present day. What the peculiar privileges and powers of the highest Order are may be learned from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to Timothy and Titus, one of whom was Bishop of Ephesus, and the other of Crete." "*To the* FIRST ORDER *of the Christian Clergy was committed the* SOLE POWER OF

ORDAINING MINISTERS in the Church of Christ."—(*Ibid.*, p. 350.)

BISHOP HOBART (consecrated May 29, 1811).—The opinions of this eminent man are so well known, that it is hardly necessary to quote a sentence; yet, in accordance with the course hitherto pursued, he will be permitted to speak for himself. We may say, in passing, that those who like to put up a scolding-post represent Bishop Hobart as the introducer into America of the doctrine of Succession, etc., but with what propriety the foregoing extracts will show:

"The Church is a divinely constituted society, of which Christ is the Head. Its officers must derive their commission from Him, its Head. This commission is transmitted through a superior Order of the ministry (among whom ranked Timothy and Titus), afterwards called Bishops. * * * Union with the Church cannot exist where we are not in union with the ministry deriving their power through the legitimate channel, from the Head of the Church. The Churchman, believing that this Order is the Order of Bishops, would think that, in separating from their ministrations, he cut himself off from the communion of the Church, and was guilty of the sin of schism."

"These opinions may not now be popular. And yet they *were* popular. They were the only principles recognized in those ages when the Christian faith was most pure, Christian morals most holy, and the Christian Church most united. * * * Let not the clamors of our Protestant brethren who are, unfortunately, destitute of the primitive bond of Church Union, in the Order of Bishops, intimidate us from avowing and acting on the principle which the Churchman, in every age, has avowed and acted on; and which one of the first Bishops of the Christian Church, a disciple of an Apostle, the venerable martyr Ignatias, lays down: 'Let no man do anything of what belongs to the Church, without the Bishop.'"—(*Charge delivered at New Haven*, 1818.)

BISHOP R. CHANNING MOORE (consecrated 1814).—When this Apostolic man was placed over the diocese of Virginia, the interests of the Church were at a very low ebb. "For several successive years not

even a Convention had been called, or a single combined attempt made to preserve the Church from irretrievable ruin." Its condition may be guessed, from the statement made at the time in a letter of Mr. (afterwards Bishop) Meade, that the congregation at Richmond, which was "by far the largest body of Episcopalians in the Southern country." was so ignorant of Church doctrine, or so unstable in character, that, "*if a clever Presbyterian should offer, they will throw away Episcopacy and fall under his banners.*" This will explain the following passage from Bishop Moore's pen:

"Had we been all Episcopalians, in the *strict* sense of the word, the Church of Virginia would not have been in her present languid condition. We had most of the principal people with us, and if they had been united in sentiment, acting in accordance with the spiritual government to which we belong, we should have commanded their respect and obtained their support. PARITY OF ORDER *and the doctrine of* EPISCOPACY *are two distinct things, and to incorporate them is as much impossible as to unite water with oil.* The committee and myself must take special care that we do not lose sight of the above principle."—(*Memoir*, p. 223.)

BISHOP GRISWOLD (consecrated 1811):

"Soon after the second ordination of the twelve, 'the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them' forth to teach. Thus it appears that during Christ's ministry there were three different orders or grades of preachers. First, Himself, acting as High Priest or Bishop, in his own person, and governing the Church; secondly, the twelve, and, thirdly, the other seventy." "The law given by Moses was a shadow of good things to come; it, in all things, typified the gospel state, and is called a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. And, accordingly, it had the THREE ORDERS of the ministry (the High Priest, the Priests and the Levites), with different and distinct powers and duties." "St. Matthew informs us that Christ, in giving his Apostles their final commission, begins by saying 'All power is given unto mé in Heaven and in earth,' showing that he had authority to ordain them to any ministry. And then, as St. John tells us, he mentions the ministry which he actually did give them: *such as his Father had given him.* He appoints

them to the office he was leaving, Christ glorified not himself to be made an High Priest, but had, like Aaron, his type under the law, a regular call to the office. Nor did the Apostles take the honor to themselves; they were sent by Christ, as he was by the Father."

The powers given unto the Apostles were:

"First, to exercise discipline and govern the Church. * * * They were also commissioned to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. * * * He also promised to be with them, even to the end of the world—*evidently meaning them and their* SUCCESSORS *in the same office.*" * * * "They were sent by Christ as the Father had sent him, and, of course, to minister to the Church as he had ministered, and to appoint such ordinances as the new dispensation might render expedient, *such as ordaining to the Ministry*, &c., &c." "What we teach and firmly believe is, that in the Apostles' days (as has been the fact ever since), there were THREE *different Orders;* but we do not say or suppose that they were distinguished exactly by the same names then as now. The words Bishop, Elder and Deacon, which we now appropriated severally to three different grades, were then sometimes used *for all the Orders.* The Apostles were called Elders and also Deacons. The Elders, Presbyters or Priests (which are all words of the same meaning), were then also styled Bishops, a name which signifies overseers, because they had the oversight of congregations or parishes. But ever since the Apostles' days, none but those who have the general oversight of all the Churches in a City, or State, or Province, *with power to ordain,* are called Bishops."—(*On the Apostolical Office.*)

DR. FREDERICK BEASLEY (1777–1845), former Provost of Pennsylvania University:

"Episcopacy rests upon the strong foundation of the sacred Scriptures. *It is an irrefragable truth, that the Episcopal form of Church Government is the* ONLY ONE *Christ hath prescribed in His Word;* it is the only one which was known in the universal Church for fifteen hundred years. Whilst our Saviour remained on earth he, of course, held supreme authority in his Church. The twelve were appointed by him as his subordinate officers. The seventy disciples constituted a still lower Order. There existed, then, in the Church of Christ at this time, *three distinct grades* of Ministers. When our Lord ascended into Heaven—when he breathed upon the twelve and said, 'As my Father

sent me, even so send I you,' he transmitted to them the same authority which he himself had retained during his continuance amongst them. The twelve commissioned their Presbyters and Deacons, to aid them in the administration of ecclesiastical government. Before their death they constituted an order of Ministers, to whom they conveyed that Supreme authority in the Church, which was lodged in their hands during their lives. *To this Order of men, who* SUCCEEDED THE APOSTLES *in dignity and authority, the appellation of* Bishops was, in process of time, peculiarly appropriated. Ever since the times of the Apostles this Order has always possessed prerogatives *peculiar to itself. It has always held,* EXCLUSIVELY, THE POWER OF ORDINATION, *the privilege of communicating the sacerdotal authority.* These are positions which may be established by an accumulation of evidence from Scripture and the testimony of ancient writers, that will defy all opposition." — (*Letters of Cyprian*, A. D. 1807.)

BISHOP RAVENSCROFT, of North Carolina, consecrated 1823:

"Before the Apostles finished their course respectively, they committed unto faithful men, by Divine direction, that commission and authority for the rule and government of the Church, for the guardianship of the faith and the fulfilment of the Gospel dispensation which they received from Christ, and Christ from the Father. In which transfer they gave instructions for the due and faithful performance of the duties peculiar to their office with directions that they also should, in like manner, 'commit the same to faithful men, who should be able to teach others,' and thus continue the line of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION unbroken to the end." — (Vol. i., p 125.)

"As Christ's commission and authority derived from the Father admitted a transfer of it to his Apostles, in like manner the commission and authority of the Apostles derived from Christ admitted and, in fact, included a like transmission to others."

"In the necessary powers and qualifications for its goverment, &c.. &c,, the Apostles both could have and did have Successors, which have continued in an unbroken line of transmitted authority to this day, through the Order of Bishops, as the only lawful and verifiable source of spiritual rule in the Kingdom of Christ." — (P. 127.)

DR. JOHN BOWDEN (1751–1817), Professor in Columbia College, A. D. 1808.—His admirable and conclusive letters to Dr. Miller, are in the very best

vein of controversial writing—fair, candid, courteous, but forcible:

"If the HOLY GHOST inspired the Apostles to establish Episcopacy in the Church, it is certainly of Divine institution, although there may be no express and formal precept for that purpose. Or if the Apostles, by virtue of the commission which they received from JESUS CHRIST, established Episcopacy, it must, if not immediately, yet mediately be grounded upon Divine institution. For if the Apostolic commission was founded upon Divine authority, as it certainly was, then all commissions derived from that source, and within the limits of that commission, are also mediately founded upon a Divine authority, and in this sense, at the very least, every one that believes Episcopacy not to be a mere human institution, *must* believe it to have a divine sanction."—(P. 245.)

"Thus, then, it appears to be capable of demonstration, that an UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION of Ministers is ESSENTIAL to the Christian Church; and if there has been any failure, a ministry deriving its authority from Christ has also failed. But this we know cannot be, for Christ has promised that it should not; and what he has promised he is certainly able to fulfil. And as the Order of the Clergy is a positive institution of the great head of the Church, so the different degrees of the ministry must, of necessity, be a positive institution by the same authority. If, then, Episcopacy has been proved to be a divine institution, it as necessarily follows that *the* SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS *has been as uninterrupted as the ministry.* For if to the Order of Bishops the power of ordaining was attached, then it follows that the Episcopal Order is essential to the perpetuity of the Ministry. Of course, a succession of such ordainers is essential. *Admit, then, that Episcopacy is a divine institution, and the Succession is a matter of necessity,* and is no more capable of failure than the [whole] ministry is."—(P. 316.)

The opinions of Bishops Kemp, Chase, Dehon, Bowen, Wainwright, Doane, and others, on the present topic, are too well known to require illustration. We therefore pass on.

BISHOP H. U. ONDERDONK, of Pennsylvania, consecrated 1827.—In his excellent tract, "Episcopacy Tested by Scripture." the distinctive principles of

the Church are ably maintained. We can give only a brief extract or two:

"Parity declares that there is but ONE ORDER of men authorized to minister in sacred things. * * * Episcopacy declares that the Christian ministry was established in THREE ORDERS, called, ever since the Apostolic age, Bishops, Presbyters or Elders, and Deacons, *of which the highest* ONLY *has the* RIGHT TO ORDAIN."—(P. 11.)

"Scriptural proof having been given for Episcopacy, down to the latest date of the inspired canon, and it having been shown that no other Ministry is set forth in the New Testament, all is done that was proposed in the beginning of this essay."—(P. 39.)

Bishop Onderdonk expressly repudiates the idea of "unchurching" non-Episcopal denominations; but he argues strongly, as we have shown elsewhere, against justifying the Foreign Reformed Churches on the ground of necessity:

"We think it doubtful whether Luther and his associates and Calvin and his associates were prevented from obtaining Episcopacy by difficulties strictly *insuperable*." "When the difficulty *appears* great, those who yield to it are, we doubt not, excused by a merciful God, and they ought to be fully and readily excused by man. But this mild judgment of persons does not establish either the correctness of their opinions or the *validity of their acts*." "Least of all can the supposed necessity which may formerly have lead to a deviation from divine institutions, be a sound plea for persevering in that deviation, after the supposed necessity has ceased."—(P. 42.)

BISHOP J. H. HOPKINS, of Vermont, consecrated 1832, and now Presiding Bishop of this Church. This learned and able divine, in his "Letters on the Novelties which Disturb our Peace," published in 1844, takes as low ground for Episcopacy as it appears possible to take, without wholly abandoning the Church's doctrine.

"The first question to be settled is this, namely: Whether Episcopacy is *essential* to the very being of the Church of Christ, so that there can be *no Church* where there is no Episcopacy.

And here I beg leave to be understood as distinctly maintaining, that the institution of the Episcopal government is *divine*, because Apostolic. In the words of the venerable Hooker, I would say without the least reservation, 'Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of Bishops was even from God. The Holy Ghost was the author of it. But it does not necessarily follow from this that the loss of Episcopacy destroys the very being of a Church. It destroys its Apostolic *Order*, undoubtedly, * * * * * yet the Church, in its essential elements may exist notwithstanding.'"

In this last clause, and others like it, we recognize the effect of the "Puseyite" controversy, just as we find it displayed in Bishop Meade's "True Churchman," a charge delivered in 1851. In consequence of unfair deductions from certain established principles, or the undue prominence given to some particulars of doctrine by the Oxford writers, those who were startled and pained at the tendency of their "Tracts," began to change their ground, and to be careful of granting the original principles, lest the inferences would follow. Some denied what all Churchmen had previously taught, and some even contradicted publicly what had been upheld in their own writings through a long course of years. We believe that the good Bishop wrote under the influence of this feeling—that fearing to yield too much to the "Newmanites," he went a little too far in the opposite direction. Yet, after all, *bating a single word or two* here and there, he has written nothing on the subject which could not be supported by the authority of some of our greatest divines, and nothing to which we ourselves would not cheerfully subscribe.

Bishop Henshaw, of Rhode Island, consecrated 1843:

"We all believe in the Apostolic institution of Episcopacy, and, of course, acknowledge that it has the divine sanction and approbation; for inspired Apostles would institute nothing in opposition to the will of God." "[The Episcopal Church] does not, as the phrase goes, "unchurch" other denominations. She does not condemn a Non-Episcopal Ministry, and pronounce all its acts *invalid;* nor does she even declare them to be irregular, *for it was no part of her business to assert negatives.* But she does positively affirm the Apostolic origin and universal prevalence of the ministry under the Episcopal form, and *declares her determination to recognize no other.* In proof of this, we quote the language of the Ordinal. From the Apostles' times there have been these Orders of Ministers in—what? In the Episcopal Church as distinguished from others? No! But in CHRIST'S CHURCH, *i. e.*, the Holy Catholic Church." * * * "Upon this strongly asserted fact of the universal prevalence, from the beginning, of the ministry under the Episcopal form, our Church founds her *solemn declaration that she can* RECOGNIZE AND SANCTION NONE OTHER." "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be admitted thereto according to the form hereafter following, or hath had EPISCOPAL consecration or ordination."

"If there could be any reasonable doubt as to the meaning of our Church in this declaration, one would suppose it would be removed by her uniform *action* in the premises, under the direction of her canons. It is by no means uncommon for Non-Episcopal ministers to conform to our Church, and seek admission to Orders. A very considerable portion of our Clergy have made this transition. How are they treated on coming to the Church for admission? As clergymen, or as laymen? She will not permit such an one to serve at her altars till SHE ORDAINS HIM, *just as if he had been professedly nothing but a layman before!*" —(*The Apostolic Ministry*, pp. 5, 6.)

DR. GEORGE BOYD.—In his sermon on the "Old Paths," preached April, 1836, maintains the following propositions:

(1) "The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ is a visible society, divinely constituted for special purposes." (2) "The Lord Jesus Christ instituted, in this Church, *a ministry to be perpetuated to the end of the world, which ministry consisted of* THREE ORDERS." (3) "Such a society being instituted and thus organized, it becomes the bounden duty of every one who hears the Gospel, if he can find access to this Church, to connect himself with it." (4) "The Protestant Episcopal Church in the

United States is identically the same Church as the Apostolic, and *has been continued in* DIRECT *and* REGULAR SUCCESSION *from the time of the Apostles to the present day.*"

J. FLAVEL MINES, a prominent Presbyterian Minister, converted to the Church.—He has left his opinions on record, and used very plain language:

"My old religion teaches that three or four good laymen may come and lay their hands on my pious bootblack, and make him as true a minister of Jesus Christ as myself—equal in dignity, and right, and power." "I regard it no small thing to have recovered the ancient EPISCOPACY."—(*Presbyterian Clergyman, &c.*, p. 569.)

DR. DORR, the present venerable Rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, quotes from Bishop Horne and Archbishop Potter:

"'In order to preserve his Church till this last period of time, Christ hath promised to be with his Apostles and their Successors always, even unto the end of the world.'" "This is the substance of the Archbishop's first chapter, and his positions appear so evident as hardly to require any proof that the Christian Church, is an outward, visible, spiritual society, universal as to time and place, and one whereof men are obliged to be members."

"'Let them produce,' says Tertullian 'the origin of their Churches; let them unfold the Order of their Bishops, so proceeding by REGULAR SUCCESSION from the beginning, that their first Bishop may be showed to have been appointed either by one of the Apostles or by Apostolical authority.' *The Church thus constituted derives its origin from one common source; it is built upon the same foundation and after one uniform model; it is subject to the same Orders of the ministry whose commission has been regularly handed down from the Apostles,*" &c., &c.—(*Churchman's Manual*, pp, 120–123.)

DR. CHAUNCEY FITCH.—In his ingenious and able Tractate on James, the Lord's brother, says:

"The theory of an Apostolic Ministry is that it is derived from Christ through those whom he empowered to organize and govern the Church. Civil power may be conferred by the gov-

erned upon their rulers, but the Christian Ministry comes from Christ *down* to the people. * * It was by the putting on of the Apostles' hands the first Ordination was conferred. When one was admitted in this way to be a Deacon, an Elder, or a Bishop, he received a part of the Apostolic Ministry. Those Elders whom Titus ordained in every city of Crete obtained a part of the same Ministry which Titus had, but not the whole —not that part of it which would authorize them to ordain others. If one of these Elders had taken upon him to ordain without having received authority so to do, a ministry thus begun would not have been Apostolic."

In reply to the question, "What is it that is conveyed by the Apostolical Succession?" Dr. Fitch replies thus:

"It is safe to say—just that LEGAL AUTHORITY which could be conferred by Ordination and which would be necessary to perpetuate the same Church in all its integrity. * * * Authority to do what St. Paul in his Epistles instructs Timothy to do at Ephesus, and Titus at Crete, could be conveyed perpetually by Ordination. Such authority, committed to faithful, men would sustain and leave the Church of Christ, at the end of time, the same Church it was at the beginning. Authority to do these things, disconnected from inspired guidance and supernatural gifts, is all that is claimed by those who, through a *regular Succession of Ordinations from the Apostles*, now exercise the office of Bishop in the Church of Christ."—(P. 69.)

Prefixed to this treatise we find a letter from Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, recommending it strongly.

We have thus brought this chain of witnesses down, in regular order, from the first Bishops of our Church in this country, to the present presiding Bishop and others yet alive. We have been obliged to omit many writers and much matter; but enough has been supplied to show that here, as in England, the doctrines held and publicly taught by Episcopalian divines have been always the same in substance, and in complete harmony with our Standards.

CHAPTER XIII.

LOW-CHURCH DIVINES, ETC.

WE have stated that the Reverend Mr. Goode has no right to put himself forward as the champion of Low-Churchmen—that his views and the views of those of whom he affects to be the representative are widely different, and this we now proceed to prove.

We have quoted in Chapter XI., the works of Burnet and Chillingworth, of Davenant, Hall, and Usher, who might be pointed to as substantiating our statement; but we prefer giving the opinions of those who have lived more recently, and been fairly classed with that known as the "*Evangelical party*" both in England and America.

Let it be borne in mind that Mr. Goode contends for a parity of Order between Bishop and Presbyter; that he denies the *divine right* of Episcopacy, claiming for it "*only* apostolical precedent" or a venerable antiquity; and that he scouts the whole theory of Apostolical succession as anti-Evangelical and "monstrous." It will be found that they speak a different language.

THE GREAT AUTHORITY on the Evangelical side is the monthly magazine known as the CHRISTIAN OB-

SERVER. It was founded as the organ of the party or body of men to whom at the close of the last century, the name of "Evangelicals" was given, or by whom it was appropriated. Its first editor was Zachary Macauley (father of the historian). He was succeeded by Rev. S. C. Wilks, and under these it continued to be in all respects the same for at least half a century.

In the first volume (published 1802) we find communications from "Wayring," from which the following sentences are extracted:

"There were THREE ORDERS of Ministers in the Primitive Church, Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons."

"The Apostles governed the Christian Church during their life, and when the charge became too burdensome, they appointed others with Apostolical authority to assist, who were afterwards called Bishops for the reason mentioned by Theodoret." "*There were some ecclesiastical offices which common pastors were not allowed to perform*—the *Apostles or an Apostolical man must* PRESIDE AT EVERY ORDINATION."—(Page 573.)

"The Apostolical origin of Episcopacy being admitted, the great question is *not* whether the Christian Church can subsist without this Order any more than whether it can subsist without spiritual worship, but, *whether I am justified in rejecting the Order which is clearly Apostolical?*" "If I am asked what I think of those foreign Protestants who have cast off the Episcopal government, I answer '*nothing.*' To their own master they stand or fall. The question seems to me irrelevant; it becomes not me to decide respecting the state of others, but with humility and fear to follow the steps of the Apostles as they followed their Master."

"It will be easy to see *what degree of importance attaches* to the *numerous ordinations of certain classes of Dissenters* which we see advertised in the public prints, where one prays, and another exhorts, and another sings, and ALL ARE EQUALS. These things derive a consequence from the air with which they are brought forward; but it is sufficient to say that *nothing similar* appears in any part of the New Testament."—(Page 771).

In the second volume (A. D. 1803) an article appeared on "Episcopacy as a Distinct Order in the

First Century.". We take the following from its opening paragraph:

"It [Episcopacy] simply consists in a commission derived from the Apostles of Christ to continue the Succession of its own and the inferior orders of Ministers in the Church, and to exercise jurisdiction over those Orders as well as over the people committed to their charge."—(Page 709).

In the third volume, this article is continued, the editor maintaining that "Episcopacy was instituted by the Apostles, and, therefore, comes from God." On page 29 he quotes, approvingly, this strong sentence from Jones, of Nayland:

"The Church has been governed by BISHOPS, PRIESTS, and DEACONS from the Apostles downwards, and where we find THESE ORDERS *duly appointed*, the Word preached, and the sacraments administered, THERE *we find the Church with its form and authority.*"

In the fourth volume, Archdeacon Daubeny is commended for his advocacy of Episcopacy in his "Guide to the Church."

In the volume for 1828, we have the following reference to the Moravians:

"Amid all their sufferings they did not forget *the* DUTY *of perpetuating a pure Episcopal Church*, after the existing race of their pastors who had received *regular ordination by Bishops* should become extinct. They could neither expect nor wish for assistance in this matter from the Church of Rome, nor even from the Calixtine Bishops. They, therefore, had recourse to the Waldenses, whose Prelate, Stephen, before his martyrdom, with the assistance of another Bishop, consecrated three of their Priests, from whom the Episcopate has been regularly maintained in their Church to the present moment, in the same manner as Anglican Episcopacy is in Scotland or the United States of America. The British Parliament has formally recognised them as a regular Episcopal Church."

The writer of such paragraphs as these had certainly no fellowship of opinion with Mr. Good. It

was not then "Evangelical" to surrender the divine right of Episcopacy or to sneer at "Apostolical Succession." But to proceed.

In the number for May, 1830, the editor, reviewing the sermons of Bishop Griswold, says:

"Our American Episcopalian friends are 'High' (or rather as we should say, '*true*') Churchmen. They adhere to Episcopal discipline where Episcopacy has no civil privileges, no secular patronage, no numerical distinction, no cathedrals, no titles, no endowments, no splendor, nothing but *pure scripture authority.*"

In December, 1832, it contained the memoir or notice of Drs. Johnson and Cutler, to which we have already referred, and in which it is stated plainly that it was *impossible* for those Congregational ministers after studying works upon Church polity, not to suspect "*the lawfulness and validity of their own ordination.*"

Very soon after this the Tractarian controversy began, and its influence became apparent in the tone of the "Observer," yet it did not for a moment abandon the distinctive doctrines of the Church.

In April, 1834, noticing a sermon by Archbishop Wake, on Unity, the editor says:

"The Archbishop, though he was *very far from undervaluing the privilege and advantage* of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, *which* WE *most firmly believe belongs to the Church of England*, at the same time saw what a dangerous weapon was furnished to the Church of Rome by the language which some Episcopalian Protestants have used upon the subject."

In the same volume (April number) the editor says of "external Apostolical Succession:"

"We fully approve and highly appreciate that Succession."

And again, in the August number:

"We cannot see, with an admirer of the Oxford Tracts, how

the inculcation of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, *though we fully believe that Succession*, is to silence the objectors to our national ecclesiastical establishment."

In 1837, commenting on some extravagant or heretical language of J. H. Newman, the editor says:

"We are as conscientious Episcopalians as the Tract writers; *aye, and as firm believers in the Apostolical Succession also, though not with its Popish overlaying;* and we therefore the more lament to witness exaggerated statements like these."

Again, in the same year, he says:

"If the present question were between the Church of England and Foreign Churches, and, still more, if it were between us and the Dissenters at home, we should stand up as earnestly to defend Episcopacy and the regulations of the Church of England as we are now doing to oppose what we consider unjust representations of them. *The Foreign Churches became Non-Episcopal from the pressure of circumstances, not from predilection, and ought not to be 'unchurched' or considered schismatical.* THE CASE OF DISSENTERS AMONG OURSELVES STANDS ON VERY DIFFERENT GROUNDS; and our only remark upon it shall be, 'What have we to do to judge them that are without?—them that are without God judgeth.'

"Let men *in this lax day* say what they will, *there is such a sin as* SCHISM; and, unless the Church of England be unscriptural, so as *to justify and* REQUIRE *secession* [from it], *we see no alternative, but that those who, being situated within its limits, forsake it, are guilty of that sin.*"

And again, in the same volume, speaking of Hooker, the writer says he held

"*The doctrine of* APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, AS EVERY TRUE CHURCHMAN DOES, *with its legitimate results.*"

Would it be possible to find in any "High Church" periodical language more directly opposed to the levelling doctrines of Mr. Goode and his American followers? Here is more of the same sort, from the next issue of the "Observer," which is valuable, not only as an index of the writer's views, but as cor-

roborating what we have herein maintained as to the Fathers and founders of our Church:

"Hooker and Jewell, and the first Reformers, *maintained the* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION *of the Christian Ministry from the times of the Apostles, and also the* THREE ORDERS, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; but they did not infer that a communion which, either from misapprehension of Scripture, or *from unavoidable circumstances*, was deprived of Diocesan Episcopacy, was without the limits of the covenant of divine mercy."

And here is a passage which by anticipation judges the course pursued recently in New York, by those who have accepted Mr. Goode's novel theory:

"The Bishop of London [Blomfield] lately said in Parliament that *the promiscuous interchange of pulpits, advocated by the Rev. Baptist Noel, would make* THE CHURCH 'A NOAH'S ARK;' *and so* WE THINK IT WOULD. We do not mean in the better typical sense, but in the colloquial sense intended by the Bishop.

"But we see no reason why PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIANS should not officiate for each other, under suitable regulations, *more especially as our Churches are open without bar to conforming Popish Priests.*"

Here, then, we have the teaching of this acknowledged and able organ of the Evangelical party, *for a space of forty years*, and we find it to be utterly at variance with the theory now attempted to be palmed off upon the American public as "Evangelical."

The evidence of the "Observer," inasmuch as it did not speak for one alone, but for all of the Low-Church section, would of itself expose the groundlessness of Mr. Goode's claim to represent that body, and would justify our statement to that effect; but it is best to add the express statements of some of those men whose names are household words, and who are well known to have been leaders of the "evangelical" movement.

LEIGH RICHMOND, in an article in the "Observer" for 1802, quotes from Lord Bacon and Bishop Pearson passages endorsing Succession, which we have printed in the eleventh chapter, and then proceeds:

"The concurrent testimony of the Apostles and succeeding Fathers clearly prove that, for the better edifying of his people, our blessed Saviour appointed officers in his Church, *entrusted with the power to ordain Successors in the ministry even unto the end of the world.*"

WILLIAM ROMAINE (1714–1795), who was regarded in his day as the lowest of all Low-Churchmen, writes thus:

"I am an old clergyman of the Church of England, and thoroughly attached to my venerable mother. Some are zealous for her peculiar doctrines, *while they break through the rules she has laid down for the orderly exercise of their office.* Others, who are so wedded to her prescribed forms of worship as not to endure the slightest deviation from them, do yet deviate as far as possible from the doctrines taught in the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Homilies, and other writings of those who compiled her Liturgy. Can either of these sorts of clergymen be true sons of the Church? I think not. Neither the stiff formalists who corrupt her doctrines, nor the *disorderly itinerants who despise her discipline*, are honestly fulfilling their ordination vows. * * * Our duty is to promote real religion, and do all the good we can, *according to the genius and order of the Church, and within the limits prescribed by her laws.* * * * We ought indeed to rejoice if Christ is preached and souls are saved, even by *irregular means*, OR UNAUTHORIZED TEACHERS; but much more, if these blessings can be obtained without *the violation of established order.* The mischiefs that attend all divisions and separations are very great and extensive. *One of these mischiefs is a spirit of insubordination, which despises the most lawful dominion, and is not afraid to speak evil of dignities.*" * * *

"In the lives of the Wesleys, Whitefield, and Ingram we see no regard paid to the discipline, the rules, and the order of the Church of England. They totally forgot that their ordination vows confined their ministration within certain limits, and bound it upon their consciences to labor 'where they should be lawfully called,' in obedience to their ecclesiastical governors. Instead of conducting themselves as regular parish Priests, they acted as Evangelists at large, ranging about and

assuming a kind of *Apostolical* tone and authority. * * * In short, they made too much haste to do good, and *in their zeal for sound doctrine and experimental religion, forgot that there were such evils as* ENTHUSIASM AND SCHISM. We have lived to see the sad consequences of these irregular proceedings."

The venerable writer then goes on to speak of Walker of Truro and Adam of Wintringham, "both clergymen of uncommon sagacity, and inferior to none of their contemporaries in real godliness," who remained faithful to their Church, obeying its rules in the spirit and the letter. He commends in passing, the "loyalty and zeal for *established Order*" which in those "perilous times" appeared in some Church periodicals, whose doctrinal teachings he could not approve. On the other hand he refers with disapprobation to some in which were

"Pompous and parading relations of chapels opened in every part of the kingdom, of ordinations, conferences, and wonderful conversions, as if nothing good were done among us but by the SECTARIES. *Nor do I like to see the names of clergymen of the Church of England appear among those of* DISSENTING TEACHERS* of various denominations on the blue cover of a magazine where is advertised 'Dr. Gill's Reasons for Separating from the Church of England'—a mischievous book ably answered by the venerable Mr. Hart of Bristol."—(*Christian Observer*, vol. i, pp. 161–3).

GEORGE STANLEY FABER (1773–1854). This very eminent divine to whose learning and diligence the Church is indebted for some of the ablest and most valuable works of the present century, shall be our next witness. In the year 1802, he preached before the University of Oxford a sermon on the Ministry, which was published immediately after. Its very title is enough to show how he judged upon the

* The very name given to the same parties by Dr. Hook, and for which he has been so freely censured.

question before us. It was this: "Divine Authority Conferred by Episcopal Ordination NECESSARY to a Legitimate Discharge of the Christian Ministry." Archbishop Laud never wrote anything stronger than that.

Mr. Faber sets out with showing that a self-appointed Evangelist, without any delegated authority, is the very same anomaly in the spiritual world as a self-appointed ambassador without any credentials would be in the political. He then exposes the fallacy of warranting invasion of the ministerial character, by those passages that are generally adduced to justifying irregular ministrations, and proceeds:

"All the Apostles derived their authority immediately from Christ," and "No person has a right to execute the office of an Evangelist without having previously received a commission."

"Here another very important matter yet remains to be considered, *Who are the persons that possess the* EXCLUSIVE *right of granting this commission?* We assert that in all ages the Church of Christ has been governed by THREE DISTINCT ORDERS, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; and we challenge our antagonists to produce from all the records of antiquity *a single instance of a Presbyteral community* previous to that established at Geneva."

"He then goes on," says the editor of the "Christian Observer," "to solve the question whether *Episcopi* and *Presbyteri* be synonymous," *as supposed by the Dissenters*, or "whether they be descriptive titles of TWO DISTINCT ORDERS *as maintained* by *the Church of England*," and to this end quotes Ignatius:

"The distinction between the three Orders being clearly pointed out by Ignatius, it will follow almost of course that PRESBYTERS *as such have* NO RIGHT *to grant a commission to preach the Gospel.*"

The editor of the "Christian Observer" says of this sermon:

"The great talents which had been displayed by the Reverend author in the execution of a much more arduous undertaking entitled *Horæ Mosaicæ*, could not but prepossess our mind in favor of the above discourse; and we have the pleasure to add that our expectation has not been disappointed. He has treated the subject with delicacy and ability.*

"It must be obvious to the judicious reader that there are many in the present day interested in the issue of this discussion, who will not be able to vindicate their own conduct, unless they are able to overturn the arguments which are here with calmness and meekness proposed to their mature consideration." —(*Christian Observer*, vol. i, pp. 447–8.)

When Mr. Faber preached the sermon from which we have quoted, he was not a novice, borne into extremes by the ardor of youth, but a mature man, an author of acknowledged power and great scholarship. It might, therefore, stand as the deliberate judgment of a divine so prominent among those known as "Evangelical:" but it need not stand alone. After an interval of twenty-three years, spent in study and ministerial work, he wrote thus:

"Respecting the divine origin of that particular form of ecclesiastical government which from its chief officer bears the name of *Episcopal*, I am not about to produce a regular dissertation. The matter lies within a very narrow compass. *To demonstrate that this polity was of* NO MERE HUMAN APPOINTMENT, *I require nothing more than* THE BIBLE, *illustrated by the attestation of two of the oldest Fathers to a* NAKED MATTER OF FACT."

"The study of the old ecclesiastical writers will not (as the Bishop of Aire imagines) conduct us of necessity to Rome: but without (I trust) making us firebrands and bigots, it will be very apt, if pursued with real candor and love of truth, to convert us into what are sometimes called HIGH-CHURCHMEN. From its abuse, this term may, perhaps, *in the present day of capricious innovation and unlearned neglect of antiquity*, have become

* If the editor of the "Observer" had only been as Evangelical as some of those who profess to follow in his footsteps, he would have spoken very differently of the discourse. We heard a sermon last year before a Diocesan Convention, in which the Church's cause was not even so strongly set forth as by Mr. Faber, and yet the "*Episcopal*" paper of the Diocese pronounced it a miserable display of bigotry!

with many a sort of bugbear; nevertheless, when *rightly understood*, the term is after all a very good term. In its genuine acceptation it simply implies *a love of Christian unity through an instrumental medium appointed by the wisdom of the Lord himself.*"

"Irenæus assures us that in every church there had been a *regular* SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS *from the time of the Apostles:* and he himself, as we have observed, was separated from St. John only by the single intervening link of Polycarp."

"Clement [the companion and fellow-laborer of St. Paul] is also an unexceptionable witness of THE FACTS which occurred to his certain personal knowledge."

Then quoting from Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, he proceeds:

"He vouches * * in terms which cannot be misunderstood, for the DIVINE INSTITUTION and the PERPETUAL OBLIGATION of that form of ecclesiastical polity * * * usually denominated EPISCOPAL; he places the institution upon the same divine authority as the matters ordained by Moses according to the commandment which he had received from heaven; he declares that one great object of the institution was the prevention of schism and disorder, * * * he specifies that AS THE APOSTLES WERE ORDAINED BY CHRIST, SO THEY BY HIS AUTHORITY ORDAINED THEIR SUCCESSORS, *the same power afterward descending from generation to generation, down to the very end of time.*"

"It has been said by those of our brethren who, rejecting Episcopacy, have adopted the Presbyterial form of Church government that *the primitive* BISHOPS *and* PRESBYTERS *were identical, and that originally there were no more than two degrees in the hierarchy.* I have diligently resorted, not to the works of partisans on either side, but to the genuine monuments of antiquity itself, and *I have not observed any evidence for such an opinion.* Irenæus, as we have seen, gives a regular catalogue of the primitive Roman Bishops, and he assures us, *merely as a* FACT, that each Church in his time possessed a strictly analogous Episcopal Succession. With Irenæus in Gaul, perfectly agrees his partial contemporary, Tertullian in Africa; for to the self same naked FACT he also most unequivocally bears witness."

"Scripture corresponds with the testimony of Clement that *the* APOSTLES ORDAINED BISHOPS AS THEIR SUCCESSORS * * * I have now produced in as brief a form as possible *my evidence to* FACTS, and *I know not where we can learn primitive order and canonical discipline if we find them not in* SCRIPTURE *explained by the unequivocally recorded practice of the two first centuries.*"

"From the Crown we receive a legal sanction to exercise our functions, whether as Bishops or Presbyters, within the limits of certain regularly defined Dioceses or Parishes, but *I am at a loss to perceive how this circumstance either snaps the chain* of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION or causes our Church to be built upon human sanctions alone."—(*Difficulties of Romanism*, Amer. edit., pp. 253, 271.)*

SAMUEL C. WILKS—In his Essay on the Necessity of a Church Establishment, published in 1841, takes for granted the principles we maintain. The Bishops are regarded as the proper pastors or rulers of the Church:

"The second means alluded to by which our Bishops may promote learning, piety, and CHURCH PRINCIPLES among the clergy was the conscientious exercise of *the power of* ORDINATION. THIS IS A BISHOP'S HIGHEST PREROGATIVE and most arduous duty; and in the wise and pious discharge of so peculiarly responsible and sacred a function must at all times rest the brightest hopes of a Christian Church."—(Page 325.)

We believe that if Mr. Wilks were now in New York or Pennsylvania, and should publish sentiments about the observance of order, and the carrying out of "Church principles" like those in this Essay, he would find some ready to denounce him as "withdrawing the minds of Christians from their spiritual life, and fixing them on outward forms;" as "going backward rather than forward with the spirit of the age," and even of "encouraging infidelity!"†

"A third method by which our Bishops may promote religion and zeal for the safety and honor of the Church, is by

* Mr. Faber was one of those whose steadfastness was affected by the Tractarian controversy, so far, at least, as that he expressed elsewhere rather more doubtfully that which here he affirms so positively and maintains so well.

† Such are the descriptions publicly given by a Presbyter of our Church of a Pastoral letter issued by his superior. In such sober and courteous language, the Rev. Dr. Canfield reviews the production of his "dear Bishop," whose "unfailing personal kindness" and "paternal spirit" he acknowledges!

maintaining its discipline. We live in an age particularly opposed to every kind of restraint and interference. So that if our forefathers wished in vain for the 'godly discipline' to be restored, it would be doubly hopeless for us to expect it now."

"The economical discipline of a Church is essentially necessary as a means to an end, and though not in itself one of the weightier matters of the law, is of indispensable importance for preserving the general fabric of its constitution, and, therefore, mediately for the advancement of real religion. Forms and ceremonies, rubrics and vestments, allotted times, seasons, and observances * * *though trifles, when put in the place of something higher, are yet necessary to be duly observed* for the sake of their connection with the general system to which, for the purposes of order and discipline, they are appended."

"It sometimes happens that clergymen who are not deficient in personal piety, or zeal for the spiritual welfare of their flocks, yet from the absence of early discipline, or of a regular education, or from not duly reflecting upon the subject, or, perhaps, in some cases, from mere ignorance or inadvertence, *are not sufficiently sensible of the importance of undeviating conformity to the minuter as to the more substantial forms* and regulations of the established Ecclesiastical polity * * * *they suffer themselves to diverge into minor peculiarities, or, perhaps, even on some occasions to* INNOVATE *upon* STRICT ECCLESIASTICAL REGULARITY." "A Bishop who is anxious for the welfare of his Diocese *cannot possibly be inattentive to points of this kind.*"—(pp. 309–311).

THOMAS H. HORNE.—Author of the invaluable "Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures."

"Although the Church of England, in common with all other Episcopal Churches, considers the UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS *to be* ESSENTIAL *to the power of* CONSECRATING and ORDAINING, yet she nowhere affirms that where the Ministry is not Episcopal there is no Church nor any valid administration of the Sacraments."

Mr. Horne was quite correct—she does not "affirm" anything of the sort; but that by no means proves that she acknowledges the contrary, or even that she does not hold those very opinions. She nowhere "affirms" that the doctrine of those called "Universalists" is heretical; but her silence will not readily be granted as implying approbation of them.

CHARLES SIMEON:

"[Our Reformers] knew that it would be to little purpose to provide suitable forms of prayer for every different occasion if they did not also secure, as far as human wisdom could secure, A SUCCESSION *of men* who, actuated by the same ardent piety as themselves, should perform the different offices to the greatest advantage, and carry on by their personal ministrations the blessed work which *they* had begun."—(*On Liturgy*, page 61.)

The representation of Simeon's views, given in the recent work of Rev. Abner Brown, extorted from the radical "Record" the acknowledgment that that good man held opinions not *now* popular with those whom it calls "Evangelical men!"

PROFESSOR SCHOLEFIELD was for a time curate to Simeon, and subsequently engaged for ten years in editing the works republished by the Parker Society. He thus speaks of Apostolical Succession:

"The existence of this Succession itself and the general nature of it, are distinctly stated in those words of St. Paul to Timothy: 'The things which thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou unto faithful men who shall be able to teach others also.' We have here a chain of Succession clearly marked out by the Holy Spirit himself, and reaching probably as far as the close of the second century after the birth of our Saviour. * * * *This line of Succession was intended to go on.* There is no reason for supposing that the Holy Spirit, who arranged it originally, designed it to be only temporary, and that it should break at any subsequent period * * * It seems in itself an arrangement so wise, so simple and obvious, so springing out of the very nature of things * * that upon the face of it it commends itself to our judgment as formed to extend onward to the end of the world."

And then, as if to silence those who are ready to denounce the theory of a "tactual Succession," he proceeds:

"There seems to be no reason why we should not understand this law of Succession to include Order as well as doctrine, i. e. that they to whom was committed the grand deposit of doctrine should receive also *the authority to preach it* from the same per-

sons from whom they received the doctrines themselves."—(*Sermons on Union*, pp. 81, 82).

The "Christian Observer" says of the learned Professor:

"His views of Christian truth were strictly Evangelical." "He was sincerely attached to his own Church, but, in stating and maintaining his *Church principles*, the habitual moderation of his mind kept him far aloof from the arrogant pretensions of certain High-Church writers, which, to some minds, have appeared so unreasonable as to lead them to the conclusion *that all Church views are either a figment or only another name for a masked Romanism.*"

BISHOP CHARLES SUMNER—the present venerable diocesan of Winchester—is quoted in the "Observer" for 1834 as sanctioning the true doctrine of "Apostolical Succession," and adding to his enunciation of it this important caution—"not to rest upon our abstract title, however legitimate."

"To little purpose we trace our genealogy in its lineal descent, unless it also be written in fleshly tables on the hearts of our people. Our hereditary Succession must stand manifest before the world * * in our Apostolical wisdom, our Apostolical prudence, our Apostolical meekness, our Apostolical zeal and love."

ARCHBISHOP SUMNER:

"If the Christian Minister boasts of deriving his commission to preach the Gospel by an UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION from the hands of the Apostles, consistency requires that he should apply to the same Apostles for the doctrines which he is to deliver."—(*On Apostolical Preaching*, Amer. Ed., p. 22.)

"It is not the least among the many blessings conferred upon the world by Christianity, that it provides for a SUCCESSION, set apart from others by character as well as station, and furnishing to all a perpetual admonition that there is a world to live for beyond the present."—(*Ibid.*, 216.)

JOSEPH JONES, of New Church.—This judicious and most excellent man, writing against the Oxford Tracts, acknowledges that the English clergy, and

especially that section or party to which he was attached, had too much neglected the whole subject of Church order; and he attributed this fact, first to the defect of their education in that particular, and to their zeal for what they held to be the weightier matters of religion:

"In our attention to the great object of our ministry we have left the Church, with regard to her regimen and ordinances, or rather her rites, too much out of our own sight and out of that of our people. Regarding almost exclusively the salvation of souls, *and wishing, perhaps, to avoid the charge of bigotry;* or being unwilling to direct the minds of men to matters which might lead to unprofitable debate and divert them, to their own great injury, from subjects of infinite importance, *we have been guilty of neglect.* We have revered and loved our Church, her regimen, ordinances and ritual; but *we have not made them the matter of close study in private, or of express and distinct declarations in public.* * * * Having become habituated to such a mode of thinking and acting, we never anticipated it could, in any way, be productive of mischief. But we are not so blind or prejudiced as not to admit, on the calm and serious consideration of the subject, that *such negligent conduct, so far as we have been guilty of it, must prove injurious, both to our people and ourselves.*" "There is undoubtedly such a thing as that which I will venture to call a *Church-spirit*, which ought to exist and to be kept alive and active in the breasts of all the members of the Church. Plant it in the breast of the layman, and then he will not only esteem and value his Church, but, to use such an expression, he will be fond of her, faithful to her, and awake whenever he joins in her holy services. Plant it in the breast of the Minister, and it will animate him in his work —it will materially contribute in giving life, energy, and solemnity to the religious ordinances."—(*On the Church*, pp. 14, 15.)

The venerable writer proceeds to reason against the idea that Church polity is a thing left free to men's own counsels or wills, and thus concludes:

"If it be *Scriptural or Apostolical, it immediately assumes a sacred character, and I do not see how men are justified in refusing or in tampering with a divine legislation.*"

And as to the objection, that there is no COMMAND to maintain any one form, he says:

"There certainly is no permission — no intimation given us of *a plurality of Churches*, or of our being at liberty to frame and rule the Church according to our own counsels and wills. The least thing that can be said is, that it is *safe* to follow Scripture and Antiquity, and that it is not a little *perilous* to refuse to be taught and governed by them. I must, therefore, maintain that *what does not identify itself with* SCRIPTURE *and* THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH *must be regarded as* THE INVENTION OF MAN, *and* NOT AS THE LEGISLATION OF CHRIST, *and thus* I look upon it as being WITHOUT WARRANT AND AUTHORITY."—(P. 23.)

"I cannot but look upon Episcopacy as standing upon an undeniably scriptural basis; and this, I think, is proved by Antiquity. I therefore regard this as the true system — as that which would have been universal and perpetual, if the Church had preserved that unity in which she began her course — as that, also, which will be universal when men shall lay aside their crude, ultra, and partial views, and establish the Church on proper ground, that is, on principles and laws that are unequivocally scriptural and primeval. But, in the maintenance of this doctrine, I would cherish most kindly feelings towards those who think differently from myself."—(P. 121.)

"The doctrine of APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, though true and sound in itself, is not, I apprehend, entirely free from obscurity, when we come to the full application of it."—(P. 122.)

"That Christ instituted an Order of men, which has been perpetual from the Apostolic times to the present day, as Ministers of the New Testament; *that* WE ARE DIRECTLY IN THE LINE OF ECCLESIASTICAL DESCENT, and that He uses us for the fulfilment of his gracious purposes, is the doctrine we maintain."—(P. 143.)

"We look upon the Church as God's Ordinance, from the beginning. * * * As to the CLERGY, we consider them as *an* ORDER *ecclesiastically descended from the Apostles;* and to them, *existing in different Orders*, belong the several duties which the Church requires to be performed." "WE ASCRIBE TO THE FIRST ORDER OF THE CLERGY THE SOLE RIGHT OF ORDAINING."—(P. 142.)

This is a long extract from one writer, but none too long, considering its value. We wish every member and minister of the Church would read the whole work from which it is taken.

CHARLES BRIDGES:

"We are led to observe the primary weight of the Ministerial Office. This gives *validity* to the sacramental dispensation. * * The Baptismal commission was not only linked with teaching, but limited to those among his disciples whom he had before separated for the express office of teaching. To the other ordinance, as standing upon the same ground of authority, the same principles must obviously be applied, so that, as Calvin justly observes, 'since the Sacraments are annexed as appendages to the mysteries of Christ, it follows that the Ministers of the Word are the legitimate dispensers of them.' Nor do the extreme cases which our great Hooker feels himself constrained to admit, * * * *in any degree invalidate the ministerial authority, or license a departure from divine order in a self-constituted administration.* What God will admit in ABSOLUTE NECESSITY * * *is one thing; what He has appointed as the general rule of His Church is another.* THE RULE, *not* the *exception*, is our STANDARD."

"We are not *always* to condemn others, but to assure ourselves. * * * Yet we must not undervalue the Order, even admitting that the essence of the Church *may be* preserved without it. *We* are far from merging our *own distinctness of authority in the loose generality of professedly Christian teaching.* We are bound to magnify our office *in the thankful acknowledgment of a* DIVINELY DELEGATED COMMISSION, *received through a* DIVINELY CONSTITUTED ORDER. We gather this conviction * * * from the identity of our Church principles with those naturally inferred from the Ministerial Epistles, and from the comparison of our Episcopal Constitution with the Christian Church from the Apostolic down to the Reformation era. *And we deem the intelligent apprehension of this conviction to be important*, not to cherish a proud and selfish bigotry, but *to give assurance to our Sacramental administration*, and to humble us under the deep weight of our responsibility."

"APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION (like its kindred term, Baptismal Regeneration), *rightly understood*, involves a true and important doctrine. With Romanists, and with Romish Protestants, it means *only* the Succession of the Order, upon which, as if it were the foundation of the Church, the whole weight is laid. OUR REFORMERS, *more soundly*, INSISTED *upon a* TWO-FOLD SUCCESSION *of Order and of Doctrine—the external and the spiritual line.* That a *Succession, combining both these points*, was intended by the Divine Head of the Church, *is manifest from the terms and extent of the promise.*" "The inspired testimony conducts this Succession through four continuous stages, without any intimation of a stop in the descent. *Viewing it, therefore,*

as THE PERPETUAL ORDINANCE OF THE CHURCH, *we cannot conceive of a* DEFECT OR BREAK *in either part, without injury to its efficient operation.*"—(*Sacramental Instruction*, pp. 130–133.)

BISHOP DANIEL WILSON, of Calcutta.—In his sermon on the Apostolical Commission, after speaking of the powers committed to the Apostles, and by them to others, such as Timothy, Titus, &c., proceeds thus:

"Nor can it be doubted whether this order of ecclesiastical government was designed, in its general features, to continue as the Apostles left it. For to suppose that an order of things, enjoined by men inspired to regulate the Church of Christ, is not binding upon us (unless, indeed, it be abrogated by an authority equal to that by which it was enacted—which is not pretended in the present instance), goes to sap the whole foundation of faith. *A regulation made by divinely authorized persons, in a society that was designed to be perpetual, is, of course,* PERPETUAL, *unless it be otherwise expressed.*

"Accordingly, it is confessed that, in point of fact, for fifteen centuries after the time of the Apostles, no government of the Church obtained but that which was administered by *Ministers, who received, in direct* SUCCESSION *from them, the* EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS OF SUPERINTENDENCE *and* ORDINATION."

After such an array of evidence from the standard-bearers of the "Evangelical party," we are at no loss to understand why the still more Evangelical Shimeall accuses *them* of Popery! His accusation may stand side by side with this acknowledgment from the Methodist advocate, Mr. Powell. Speaking of the Oxford Tract writers, he says:

"Many of the clergy of the Established Church are strongly opposed to the errors of these men, and they have spoken out manfully in the pages of 'The Christian Observer.' *They seem, however, to be very tender of this doctrine of* APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION. [And now mark the charitable surmise,] They perhaps think *it is calculated to add importance to their Ministry in opposition to the Methodists and Dissenters* (*!*) *A Spirit of* EXCLUSIVENESS *is, indeed,* VERY GENERAL *among the Clergy of the*

Established Church. An opinion, too, of the DIVINE RIGHT *of* EPISCOPACY *has spread extensively in the Church of England;* MOST OF ITS CLERGY *seem willing to believe it* (*!!*) [Mr. Goode says the number was never so small as it is now.] Hence, generally speaking, *they are not the men from whom a refutation of this doctrine of* APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION *is to be expected.*"

No! they certainly are not—at least, while true to the principles and constitution of their own Church—and, therefore, Mr. Powell was at liberty to bring his own battery to bear upon it.

We will now come to the western side of the Atlantic, and show that our American Low-Churchmen have been as sound upon the doctrines in question as their English brethren. Some, it will be remembered, were quoted in the last chapter.

BISHOP GRISWOLD:

"Christ did not promise that the working of miracles should continue to the end of the world, but that he would always be with the office; that, *while the world endured, there should be continued an* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION *of such officers in his Church*, endued with these ecclesiastical powers, and commissioned to transact with mankind the momentous concerns of their eternal salvation. The name of Apostle was not long continued. * * * After their death, their Successors in office, in honor of the first Apostles, modestly, by general consent, assumed the name of BISHOPS." "*If* GOD *has set* THREE ORDERS *in the Church, I know not who is authorized to reduce them to* ONE, *or to say that all are Apostles, having equal duthority, or all Prophets or Presbyters.*" "Much cause have we to bless God that his promise of a Christian Ministry has not failed—that these streams of his mercy have descended to us, and are watering this, our favored country." "Being about * * to advance one to a higher grade in this ministry, I thought it might be satisfactory, and, I hope, not unprofitable to the people present, to show, briefly, *by what authority we do this, and who gave us this* authority. Should there be any here who think differently on this point, they will not, I trust, regret having heard *what we think* on a subject which so much concerns us all. *Nothing will tend more to unite Christians in love, than candidly hearing from each other the hope that is in them.*"—(*On the Apostolic Office.*)

DR. W. H. WILMER:

"We find the Apostles, early after their commission, going forth and ordaining others to offices co-ordinate with their own, and giving form and order to the Church over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers. From their Acts and Epistles, *it is manifest that* ORDINATION WAS NEVER PERFORMED *but by the* HIGHER ORDER, although the Presbyters, or second Order, assisted, as in the case in ordination, by our Bishops." "Although it is the usage of our Church to have three Bishops at the ordination of a Bishop, yet one only is the ordainer. *We look upon this as* ESSENTIAL *to the conveyance of due authority, and the addition* of others is a circumstance founded upon discretion and made venerable by usage."—(*Episcopal Manual*, p. 45.)

JOHN A. CLARK, a former Rector of St. Andrews, Philadelphia, and one of the editors of the "Episcopal Recorder":

"When the Ministers of our Church place the wearing of a surplice, or the observance of Christmas, or even the use of a Liturgy, on the same ground with Episcopacy, they exceedingly weaken our cause and strengthen prejudice against us. EPISCOPACY *is an essential element in our Church organization.* We deduce its origin from the will of Christ and the arrangement of his inspired Apostles. Here we go to the Scriptures for our warrant. *This is a distinctive feature in our ecclesiastical constitution.* Without this we immediately become assimilated with the Non-Episcopal Churches around us. * * * The use of a Liturgy, the observance of Christmas, and the wearing of a surplice are matters of *mere expediency.* No one in his senses would pretend that these were of *Divine appointment.*"—(*Letters on the Church*, 1839.)

BISHOP MCILVAINE, of Ohio:

"Is not Ordination always now performed by man? True. And therein it differs circumstantially from that of the Apostles, which was performed immediately by the hands of Christ himself. But the Presbyters at Ephesus, whom Paul addressed at Miletus, were ordained by only human hands, quite as much as are Presbyters now; and yet St. Paul declared that the Holy Ghost had made them overseers of the flock of God. So that, under the laying on only of human hands, men may receive their ministry from God, *if they who ordain them minister in the name and by the authority* of God. Give us, then, the case of an Ordination performed in that name and by virtue of that authority, *and it matters not by how long a line of descent the*

commission has descended, by how long a chain of communication it is connected with the personal ministry of Christ. IF NO LINK BE WANTING, *the last link is as truly fastened to the throne of God as the first; and he who receives his ministry by such Succession, is ordained of* CHRIST *and called of* GOD, *as was Aaron.*"

"*That it is the doctrine of our Church that the line of* SUCCESSION *has been through a ministry consisting of* THREE ORDERS, *and through the highest Order of the three, the Bishops of the Church,* NEEDS NO ILLUSTRATION."

"As to imparity, or, in other words, 'divers Orders of Ministers,' the doctrine of the Church is, that this feature of the ministry is of Divine appointment. You need no stronger evidence of this than in the declaration, in so many words, connected in the office for the ordination of Priests: 'Almighty God, who by thy Holy Spirit hath appointed divers Orders of Ministers in thy Church.' This declaration the Church has taken pains to insert, also, in the collect for the ordination of Deacons, and in the office for the consecration of Bishops; of course, expecting her Ministers to join heartily in those prayers and so to express their belief. Then, as to when this imparity began, and on what evidence the belief of it is based, the preface to the [Ordinal] speaks explicity: 'It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' times, there have been these Orders of Ministers in the Church of Christ—Bishops, Priests and Deacons.' *From this declaration, it is* CLEARLY *the* DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH, *that not only ancient authors, but* HOLY SCRIPTURES, *teach the Apostolic origin of an Episcopal Ministry, in the three Orders just named.* And, since it is by none pretended that there were of right *two* descriptions of ministry in the Apostles' time—the one such as has been mentioned, the other of an essentially diverse kind—it is evidently the doctrine of the Church, that from the Apostles' times and by the evidence of Scripture, there was *no other Ministry* than that which subsisted under the several gradations of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon."

"And then, in evidence of the great stress laid by the Church on the NECESSITY OF EPISCOPAL ORDINATION, the Preface to the Ordination Office proceeds: 'To the intent that these offices shall be continued * * * or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.' THESE WORDS REQUIRE NO COMMENT TO MAKE THEM PLAINER."

"Thus far speaks the Church and no further. How the belief of these views should affect our opinion as to the *validity* of any Non-Episcopal Orders; whether, whilst *we must consider them irregular*, because wanting Apostolic precedent, we should consider them also as in all respects, *invalid*, the Church speaks

not, but leaves the question for private judgment, and alike nourishes in her bosom those who affirm and those who deny."

"According to this * * * when a candidate for Orders professes attachment to the doctrines, as well as discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, he is considered as professing fully to believe in the *Apostolical origin* of Episcopacy—to believe, also, that such origin is apparent from the Scriptures, as well as from ancient authors; and, *as a necessary consequence, that* EPISCOPACY IS THE ONLY FORM OF CHURCH ORDER CONTAINED IN THE SCRIPTURES, and manifest from ancient authors; *and, consequently, whether a Church should now be Episcopal or not, is a question not to be settled upon considerations of mere expediency,* but of deference to the model of the primitive Church, as it was constituted by the Apostles under the guidance of inspiration; so that NO ONE OUGHT TO BE ACCOUNTED A LAWFUL MINISTER IN THE CHURCH, NOR SUFFERED TO EXECUTE ANY FUNCTIONS OF THE MINISTRY, UNLESS HE HATH HAD EPISCOPAL ORDINATION."—(*Ordination Sermon at Gambier*, 1839.)

We have given this long extract from Bishop McIlvaine, notwithstanding its repetitions, &c., because of the important position he occupies as the acknowledged leader of the "Evangelical" party in the United States.

BISHOP ELLIOTT, of Georgia, [one of the Vice-Presidents of the Evangelical Knowledge Society, A. D. 1862], thus expounds and defends the "monstrous" theory of Apostolical Succession:

"Nor is this an idle matter—for it involves no less than the whole question, *whether there be any ministry at all.* If the authority which Christ left with his Apostles has been suffered to expire, *whence hath it been renewed?* and if hath not been renewed, *where is the ministry?* What right hath one man, more than another, to baptize, to preach, to administer the sacraments, or to absolve from sin? Why may not each say to his neighbor, 'Come and baptize me!' or 'Come and consecrate the [sacramental] elements, and give me to eat and drink of the body and blood of our Saviour!' This seems preposterous—nay, even blasphemous. *And yet if there has not been a* SUCCESSION *in the ministry from the time of the Apostles—if the golden chain has ever been broken at any point or at any time, this very thing must have occurred, and, having occurred* ALL

MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY HAS CEASED, FOR AN ASSUMED AUTHORITY CAN NEVER BE RIGHTFUL, *through how many links soever it may have been transmitted.* Unless each Minister can trace up to the Apostles, *he must reach a point at which the authority he exercises was usurped*, and THAT USURPATION MUST VITIATE ALL THAT SUCCEEDED." — (*Sermon at Consecration of St. John's Church, Savannah*, 1853.)

"THE EPISCOPAL OBSERVER" was a periodical published at Boston, in imitation of the London magazine from which we have quoted. It was conducted by Mr. Warren and the present Bishop Clarke, of Rhode Island, and afterwards by Rev. Drs. Butler and Spear. The character of its teachings will appear from the following extracts:

"For ourselves, *we abhor the* BRUTE RADICALISM which would wrench from the ministerial character its honorable distinction and rob the ambassadors for Christ of the divine function wherewith God hath clothed them."— (Vol i., p. 359.)

"England, properly speaking, *reformed* the Church. In Germany and other countries, it was in a sense *destroyed*, and a *new one formed* as accident directed." "*They crushed the Church*, and compelled it to give back the holy flame it concealed, *which they must enclose in a vessel formed by their hands.*" "*The radical principles which the work of destruction begets, are likely to be employed in demolishing future forms of government, and to be satisfied with nothing less than a disorganizing reign of infidelity.*"—(405, &c.)

"The chief points in which we Episcopalians differ from other denominations is in the Ministry. *We believe that our Saviour set in the Church* THREE MINISTERIAL ORDERS, which Orders are now known by the names of Bishop, Presbyter or Elder, and Deacon; that after his resurrection from the dead he solemnly invested with the highest office the eleven disciples." * * * "Our Saviour delegated to them full authority to take the oversight of his Church * * * As he was sent by the Father to ordain them, so they were sent by him to ordain others. It *was to the Apostles thus raised to the highest office, and to their successors, that the rite of confirmation* was entrusted. This was one of the divinely appointed prerogatives of their office."—(431.)

Another article in the same volume (from the pen

of the editor) distinctly affirms the *Divine right* of Episcopacy, but broaches the singular idea that, in the *jure divino* Episcopate, there are *no inherent rights or powers*—so that if a General Convention should determine to restrict Bishops to the mere preaching of the Word, they would have no right to ordain! For such a theory, or anything like it, we find no justification in any Church authority. We set much more value upon the writer's *statements* than his *notions*.

"Nevertheless it is a *Divine right*, and not the less that he derives it from the Head through the body of which he is a member."—(Page 200, &c.)

BISHOP HENSHAW:

"On the subject of the Constitution of the Christian Church, many loose and unscriptural opinions are entertained, not only by the community at large, but also by many sincere followers of Christ. Yea, there are multitudes who undertake to preach the gospel, and transact sacred offices between man and his Maker, without being satisfied that they have a divinely originated commission, or even thinking it a matter of sufficient importance to be calmly and thoroughly investigated."—(*Theology for the People*, page 193.)

"If we depart from the fundamental principle that *the Church of Christ is a Divine institution*, distinguished by a faith, ministry, and ordinances emanating from His authority, and believe that he has left it to the discretion or caprice of men to form Churches, Ministers, and Sacraments for themselves—then we must admit that the followers of any ignorant enthusiast who has presumption or pride enough to form a sect, may consider themselves entitled to the character and privileges of the Church of Christ. * * * But how monstrous would be the consequences of such an admission. The Church would then appear like a Babel of confusion, rather than like a city which is at unity in itself."—(Page 195.)

"All branches of the Christian Church agree and are one in the belief of the great doctrines of the Christian faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed, *in submission to the Ministry which the* LORD JESUS CHRIST *instituted*, and *which has been*

transmitted by REGULAR SUCCESSION *from the* APOSTLES, and in the observance of the Sacraments which He hath appointed to be the signs and seals of his covenant, and channels through which the influences of His grace are to be communicated to the souls of his people."—(*Ibid*, page 197.)

"THE EPISCOPAL RECORDER" published (in 1840), during the Puseyite controversy, some letters signed "J. W. M.," which its editor introduced, and endorsed thus:

"We have had for a few weeks in our possession a *very valuable series of articles*, the publication of which we now commence. The great respectability of their source * * entitles them to especial attention, whilst *the very impartial spirit* which they display ought to convince all who read them that they are written without prejudice. *They will be found worthy of entire confidence.*"

The contributor, after condemning the principles of the Tract writers, says:

"Few Episcopal readers of the Tracts can hesitate to approve the avowed design of the writers, at the *commencement* of the series, or to acknowledge that there are many things in them deserving of the warmest commendation. There are certain *fundamental principles* recognized precious in themselves, and highly valuable and conservative when carried only to their legitimate results, which, *however they may be presented as novelties*, or as old truths long buried and forgotten, the Churchman will recognize as *familiar elements of his Creed*, which have ALWAYS *formed* ESSENTIAL *parts of the constitution of his Faith.* If the writers had confined their discussions to the DIVINE INSTITUTION OF THE MINISTRY, the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, the defence of liturgical services, an exposure of the evil of Schism, and the modern rationalistic theology." * * * "My thorough Church principles would have prompted me to bid them God speed."

In the same paper containing this declaration, there appeared at the head of the editorial column, a notice that the Rev. Messrs. May, Clarke, Suddards, and Tyng were the editors and proprietors of the paper.

DR. STEPHEN H. TYNG.—In a sermon preached be-

fore the Diocesan Convention of Pennsylvania in 1844, this very prominent Low-Churchman spoke thus:

"We have unitedly received, and we earnestly adhere to a Ministry which we unfeignedly believe Christ our Lord established for his Church; and which his Apostles, beyond all reasonable dispute, maintained and transmitted in opening the privileges and blessings of this Church to mankind. We unitedly believe it unlawful for us to subvert or annul an organization which the Lord hath constituted as *the law of His House*. We could not, therefore, feel justified in ministering under or *acknowledging any professed authority* which does not conform to this Apostolic standard, and *derive itself* from this *Apostolic appointment*." "No imputation could be more unjust than that of looseness of adherence to this Church, or of indifference to the privilege and blessing of her *manifestly valid* and *regular Ministry*."

A little farther on, he gives a long extract from Bishop Wilson, in which the following appears:

"The Church is the means by which God upholds and preserves his Truth among mankind. It furnishes a SUCCESSION of men to expound and inculcate the Gospel."

The reverend gentleman next speaks of the assaults made upon the Church from without, and of the attempt to divide it by setting one party of Churchmen against another:

"Its failure, and the clear evidence thus furnished that, in the points at issue between us and them, there is but little variety of judgment, and NO READINESS OF CONCESSION, AMONG ANY OF OUR MINISTERS, have led to an unmasked and unrelaxing hostility to THE CHURCH ITSELF. It is now a warfare with Episcopacy, and by that name. It has ceased to distinguish between different theories of Episcopacy. It will grant peace upon no terms, other than an entire renunciation of the claims which we make to a Scriptural Ministry, and of our derived right thereto, through an appointed SUCCESSION FROM THE APOSTLES. This is a point WHICH WE CAN NEVER WITH A GOOD CONSCIENCE YIELD. We are therefore left, I fear, with but little hope of toleration in this quarter. We believe ourselves contending for the faith in the Ministry which the Lord established. And precious and desirable as is peace abroad to us, as to all Christians, we cannot make shipwreck of faith and a

good conscience to obtain it. This resulting position of necessary separation from many Christians around, whom we highly esteem, is much to be regretted. But it appears inevitable, and it is not we who have sought it, nor can the blame of it rest upon us."*

BISHOP ALFRED LEE, of Delaware:

"Another important solemnity of this day, is the ordination of our brother to the sacred Ministry. This cannot but be a matter of deep interest to those who look upon the Ministry as instituted by Christ himself, and with a promise of his continued presence and assistance even to the end of the world, who understand its object as an instrumentality for the spiritual and eternal benefit of man, and *who view the Ministerial trust as having been transmitted in an* UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION *from the days of the Apostles until now.*"

"It is probably well known to those who hear me, that our views respecting a SCRIPTURAL and AUTHORIZED MINISTRY are regarded by many around us as peculiar and objectionable. Our Church is daily denounced in no measured terms by those who call upon the common Lord, and towards whom we would cherish no feelings but those of kindness. Never was there a time when reproach was heaped upon us more unsparingly than at present. A wide prejudice is awakened against us as *bigoted* and *exclusive*, and against the Church to which we adhere, not from motives of caprice, or mere hereditary attachment, or party spirit, but from conscience toward God." * * *In holding to a Ministry of* THREE ORDERS: BISHOPS, PRESBYTERS, AND DEACONS, *to the first of* WHOM ALONE *is committed the power of* ORDAINING *men to the sacred office; in maintaining the* SUCCESSION *of this Ministry from the Apostles downwards, and in believing it a matter of conscience to recognize* THOSE ONLY *who are thus ordained as our pastors, we are only acting upon the opinion—the* UNANIMOUS *opinion—of the Christian Church for the first fifteen hundred years of its existence.* We agree with the great majority of those who call themselves Christians throughout the world to-day. It is not, therefore, a new or strange doctrine."

---

* Recent events and publications indicate a change of opinion on the part of Dr. Tyng and one other of the parties here quoted. But with their inconsistencies, we, at least, have nothing to do. They were mature men, holding important positions in the Church (one a Bishop, and the other a candidate for the Episcopate), when they so plainly and boldly avowed their Church principles. We have the right, therefore, to print their own deliberate declarations as a sufficient condemnation of their novel notions.

"We are told that the Succession of ordained Ministers comes to us through the Church of Rome, and must have been so corrupted by this channel of transmission as to have lost all value. We answer that the Succession is derived to us through the British Church, and we admit that there was a period of that Church's history during which it was brought under the usurped dominion of Rome, and drawn away by this untoward influence from the simplicity of the gospel. But we would ask the objector through what channel he receives the Bible and the Sacraments? Have THEY lost their value by coming to us through this impure medium? *If not, why should the* MINISTERIAL SUCCESSION become worthless and contemptible from the same cause."—(*Sermon at Ordination of Mr. John Long*, 1843.)

BISHOP BURGESS.—Long as our list is, we cannot forbear giving a paragraph from the pen of the learned and judicious Bishop of Maine. In his tract, "The Stranger in the Church," he says:

"Against one charge, he discovers elsewhere that *the Episcopal Church can make no defence.* It is said to be on one point *exclusive*; and he discovers that *on that point* IT IS EXCLUSIVE. It allows great freedom of judgment, it shuts out no believer from its communion, *but it admits no Minister to its pulpits* EXCEPT THOSE WHO HAVE BEEN ORDAINED BY A BISHOP. This was a rule when there were none but Episcopal Churches in the whole world. The Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Friends, the Methodists, all went out from it one after another, at different times, within the last three hundred years. They gave up what it possessed—*a Ministry of Bishops brought down in regular* SUCCESSION through all the time of Papal corruption, indeed, but from a time when the Bishop of Rome was no more than any other Bishop, except as Rome was a more illustrious city. There were Bishops in the land of our fathers as soon as there were any Christians there. The Episcopal Church is the same Church which they planted. At one time it was Romanized—and it has been reformed. *It believes that there is a value in this regular* SUCCESSION *of its Ministry.* Whether this value be greater or less, the stranger frankly acknowledges that it is not to be expected from the Episcopal Church that it will abandon its ancient rule from regard to those who have voluntarily relinquished what it has itself preserved."

Here then we close our case. The evidence is complete. If any man will venture to say, with such

principles as those publicly avowed by such men, that Mr. Goode's theory is not an innovation—a thing foreign to our Church—he must be proof against all evidence that could be produced from now till the day of doom. We have quoted here none but divines of acknowledged standing in what is known as the Low-Church party or Evangelical section of the Episcopal Church, and they *all* testify to their belief in a *Divinely instituted Ministry* constituted in THREE ORDERS, and *transmitted by a series of* EPISCOPAL ORDINATIONS *from the Apostles to us.* He, then, who looks upon Episcopacy as a thing of expediency, who talks of parity between Bishop and Presbyter, and who denounces "APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION" as a *monstrous* theory, has no place among them. HE IS NOT A LOW-CHURCHMAN—he is not an Episcopalian in any proper sense at all.

SUMMING UP.

THE investigation has now been pursued fully and fairly through all its branches. Information has been sought in all the proper sources—the Formularies, the Laws, the Practice, and the Literature of the Church—and we confidently leave it to the reader to decide whether from all, or any of these, *a single particle of evidence* has been produced in favor of the Latitudinarian doctrine advocated by the Rev. Mr. Goode.

He, and those who accept and re-echo his statements, have declared that our Church has "recognized" Presbyterian Orders; and he tries to establish this. What then has he been able to present in the

way of proof? Is there a word to that effect in our Articles or Ordinal? Not one! On the contrary, it is expressly stated that in CHRIST'S CHURCH there have always been the three Orders of Ministers, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and that among us no man shall be held to be a lawful Minister in any of these Orders, who has not been Episcopally ordained. We have found that to avoid the force of this decisive sentence, the Reverend gentleman changes his ground, and pleads that such a statement is not *totidem verbis* a declaration of the invalidity of Presbyterian ordination! That may well be granted. Neither is it *totidem verbis* a repudiation of *lay ordination* (if we may use such a term), or a recognition of Romish Orders. But it *involves* both, and the Reverend gentleman knows it well.

As has been repeatedly said, the Church is not fond of dealing in negatives, or in denunciations. Her *positive* statements answer every purpose. But our author tries to prove that this is not the case, and that in its purpose or effect the declaration referred to is not exclusive; of this, however, he makes but sorry work. He asserts, but does not convince. Every Non-Episcopalian differs with him. Every "sober and orderly son of the Church" differs with him. Common sense is against him; the logic of facts is against him. In all the world he has no one to support such an opinion, but the few ultraists who accept the argument from love of the conclusion, and some others whose partizan zeal has beclouded or warped their judgment.

But suppose that he were not totally wrong on this point — suppose he could show that in the Pre-

face to the Ordinal, Presbyterian Orders are not in any wise discountenanced or excluded? What then? Would he not have a great length to go before he would reach the point he seeks to gain? To show that the Church does not stigmatize a particular doctrine or practice is one thing, but to show that she recognizes or approves of it is quite another. The Reverend gentleman himself will acknowledge that our Church nowhere declares that the Pope shall not preach in her Pulpits, or celebrate Mass in her Chancels; but does it follow that she thereby "recognizes" the right of His so-called Holiness to do either one or the other?

In support of his own notion, our author affects to make an examination of the Formularies. But he takes no notice whatever of the 36th Article, of the Ordination Services, or any other portion of the Book of Common Prayer, than the Preface just mentioned, and the 23rd Article; and in direct opposition to fact, he describes the latter as the only one of the 39 that bears upon the subject. For *authentic* expositions of this 23rd Article he resorts to Rogers, whom he totally misrepresents; then to Burnet, Tomline and Hey, passing by all other expositors, and departing from his own rule of interpretation, which required appeal to be made *exclusively* to the writings of the very men who drew up the document.

Again, to gain a measure of warrant for his own theory, he quotes part of the Replies of 1540, giving them as the Opinions of Reformers, and even including "Bloody Bonner" among the divines of "OUR CHURCH;" yet these very Replies he does not

give in full, and he asserts or insinuates contrary to fact that those which he withholds are not against him.

He proceeds in the next place to examine the Laws of the Church, and in all the Code, from all the Canons, injunctions, and so forth, from the days of the Reformation down, he can only find FOUR WORDS that he ventures to produce as favoring his theory; and to make them serve his purpose, he describes a Church that had its Archbishops and Bishops, as "Presbyterian"—just as the Church of Scotland is now!

After this he takes up the Practice of the Church, and to substantiate the extraordinary statement, that for a hundred years Presbyterian Ministers were received and employed in the English Church, on the same footing as those who were Episcopally ordained; he points to ONE FACT, viz., that a license was given by Archbishop Grindal to a man who had been "ordained" in Scotland, and who (for anything that Mr. Goode can show to the contrary) may have been as good an Episcopalian as Bishop Sage himself! This case has been effectually disposed of, and other fact he has none to show.

He then takes up the writings of Bishops and Clergymen, and quotes passages containing charitable or friendly references to Foreign Protestants. But what do all these amount to? Let them be considered well—what is their value in this discussion? *just nothing.* These opinions are not the VOICE of the CHURCH; they bind no one; and after all they are no more than amiable expressions and apologies or pleas for the Continental Churches, *on account*

of the circumstances which COMPELLED *them to do without an Episcopate.* If the Reverend gentleman could give another hundred, or thousand of such quotations, it would not help his case; *for he has to show that our Church* RECOGNIZES PRESBYTERIAN ORDINATION AS SUCH, *and not that she judges charitably of those who by stress of circumstances may be obliged to act as if they were Presbyterians in principle.* What may be done under hard NECESSITY is one thing; what is regular and lawful under ordinary circumstances is another. Yet among all that the Reverend gentleman has quoted, there is not even one plain declaration from any Episcopal Divine that Presbyters have the right to ordain. When arguing against "exclusiveism," he insists upon direct statement—explicit language. So then do we with reference to "recognition." Where is this found? There is none. Even those who appear most favorable to his theory, say expressly that for Presbyters to undertake Ordination in a free State, and while the Church is at peace, would be "over-great presumption," "Schism," and a "GREAT SIN." So that he really receives neither aid nor comfort, even from his own witnesses. They all declare for a divinely constituted Ministry of THREE ORDERS—so do we. They say they do not wish to anathematize the Foreign Churches—we say the same. They say they are not prepared to deny that there may be *validity* in the ministrations of persons so situated—we say the same. They say the grace of God is not withheld from them—we readily and *thankfully* confess that it is not. But what of all this? Does it prove that our Church recognizes Presbyterian Orders, or that

the Congregationalists and Methodists of America, to-day, are on the same footing with the Reformers of Saxony or Geneva? To propose such a question is almost an insult to the reader's understanding.

We claim, then, that Mr. Goode has utterly and ignominiously failed to establish his theory, even in a single point. He has offered much in the way of evidence that no judge would think of receiving, but he has not, among it all, produced one item that would warrant either his sweeping conclusions or his bold assertions.

On the other hand, we have gone through the whole subject with patience and care, and have shown, as we believe, beyond all possibility of denial, that from the first year of its existence as a free Church to the present time, the Church of ENGLAND has held the doctrines of EPISCOPACY *by divine right* and APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, and that our AMERICAN CHURCH having received them from her, maintains them still, as consistent with sound reason, the practice of the primitive Church, and the infallible Word of God.

Doctrines of a contrary character have been advocated by a few Episcopalians, such as Hoadley, Croft, Arnold, and Whately, some of whom were as crotchety as they were gifted, and others so loose in their theology as to make it doubtful whether the epithet "Latitudinarian" was not too flattering for them. Their denial of Apostolical Succession, etc., has been re-echoed by some whose general orthodoxy we have no desire to impeach. This, as we have shown, is the result of partyism, When Newman, Pusey, and Manning began to press their peculiar tenets, giving to Church polity more than its due measure of im-

portance, others felt bound to give it less. The one extreme provoked the other. Those demanded more than ever the Church had claimed. These, then, began to doubt what she had always maintained. From doubt to denial was an easy step, and soon taken; and what they denied they denounced. Zeal for Episcopacy was regarded as concealed Romanism! Thus they yielded up point after point until they had nothing left; and differed from other Presbyterians in this only, that they chose to remain in the Church whose distinctive principles they had abandoned. Had they been content to occupy this anomalous position in silence, we should have been silent too.

And now, that we have done with the subject, we feel not only at liberty, but actually *bound*, to say something respecting the real character of this widely circulated and much vaunted "Essay on Orders," by the Rev. William Goode. We have conducted this discussion calmly and courteously. We did not, at any time, however strong the provocation, denounce the author, or accuse him of palpable and wilful violation of truth. He has not been sparing of such language towards others, even when he furnished no proof to sustain it—we have preferred to give the proof and withhold the language. We desired that the evidence should accumulate so as to establish the the point, and thus prepare the reader for what otherwise would have appeared a harsh and unjust judgment. But with the proof here given, we need no longer hesitate to speak plainly; and now we declare that though we have read even Jesuit books of controversy, this "Essay on Orders" is by far the most

dishonest—the most manifestly and shamefully dishonest—production that we have ever seen, of its size. Another man might have set forward the same statements, or given the same extracts (as some of Mr. Goode's American followers have done), without any dishonorable intent; but no sane person would think of excusing *him* on the score of ignorance or mistake. We scout the idea. The writer of that Essay (to say nothing of other works), is a man of extensive reading, and of too acute a mind for either plea to be admitted. He has offended where offence *must* have been intentional, and has done it so often and so grossly, that, henceforth, we could not be induced to accept a single statement or quotation on his authority. What he has said of others is eminently true of himself, namely, "that he parades with unblushing effrontery, the names of divines who have directly and clearly opposed his views, as advocates in his favor," and that he has been "guilty of other inconsistencies and offences against truth." As we utterly despise such arts, so we despise the man who resorts to them, whatever may be his name, his party, or his pretentions.

And now it remains to be seen whether the grave and Reverend Seigniors who were so ready to commend and circulate his book, will, after this exposure, continue to give it their confidence and applause. Some, we know, *will* do so, for such is the blinding power of partyism, that those who become its subjects steel themselves against fact and reason. They do not want to be set right. They shut their eyes and ears to what is against their cause; we trust, however, that none will go so far as to say, "*per fas aut nefas*—let that cause be served."

APPENDIX.

A.—CATENA OF ATTACKS AND ADMISSIONS.

It would seem a work of supererogation to offer proof of the assertion that the distinctive principles of the Reformed English Church have been well known from the very beginning of its career to the present time; but, in these days, no one can tell what is or is not unnecessary. We sometimes hear the most notorious facts denied, and the most truthful statements cavilled at. It may, therefore, be well to fortify our assertions.

The question of Protestantism is not before us. We have then only to prove that the *Episcopal* character of the Church of England has always been maintained—that there has been no deviation from the principles and practices adopted at first. This we shall show in a series of extracts from non-Episcopal writers:

A. D. 1549.—In this year, as all acknowledge, the Church pronounced it "EVIDENT unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in the Church of Christ: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons," etc., etc.

Here then begins the testimony of non-Episcopalians:

A. D. 1550.—"Holy Orders, as they are commonly called, had been a subject of grave consideration." "*The popish notion of* THREE ORDERS *was maintained.*"—(*Hist. British Non-conformity*, P. 372; London, 1831.)

A. D. 1573.—Dr. Whitgift [afterward Archbishop] issued his Defence against Cartwright, the Puritan, wherein he "*plainly claimed in the right of all Bishops, a superiority belonging to them over all the inferior clergy*, from GOD'S OWN ORDINANCE, to the *Popish injury of her Majesty's supreme Government.*"—(*Sir F. Knolly's Letter to the Lord Treasurer.*)

A. D. 1558.—"Prelacy was put in serious danger by the political nonconformity of the Popish Bishops, and difficulties arose respecting *the preservation of that Holy Order!*"—(*History of British Non-conformity.*)

"*The Church then adopted, and* HAS NOT YET RENOUNCED, the inconsistent and absurd opinion that the Church of Rome, though idolatrous, is the only channel through which *all lawful power of ordaining Priests, of consecrating Bishops*, and *validly performing any religious rite, flowed* FROM CHRIST THROUGH A SUCCESSION OF PRELATES *down to the latest ages of the world.*"—(*Sir James Mackintosh's Hist. of Eng.*, v. iii, page 16.)

A. D. 1588.—"Dr. Bancroft [afterward Archbishop of Canterbury] preached his memorable sermon at St. Paul's, 'in which,' says an opponent, 'he maintained that the Bishops of this realm had superiority over all the inferior clergy, otherwise than by and from her Majesty's authority, namely *jure divino*.'"—(*Puritan Tract against "Superiority of Bishops."*)

A. D. 1589.—Dr. Bridges, Dean of Sarum, having published a reply to the attacks of the Puritans, was assailed by "Martin Mar-Prelate," thus:

"Our Bishops are proud, presumptuous, Popish, paltry, pestilent, and pernicious Prelates." "They are cogging and cozening knaves. *They are lambs of Anti-Christ. They will lie* like dogs." "They usurp their authority." "*They claim this authority over those* [i. e. Presbyters] *who, by the ordinance of* GOD, *are to be under* no *pastors*, because they are equal with them."—(*Martin's Answer to Bridges; see Strype's Whitgift, Book* iii, chap. 22.)

"None were deemed properly inducted into the sacred office unless they were ordained by a Bishop; and the Ministers of those Churches which have no Bishops were declared to lack the qualifications necessary for their office, and to be [*quoad hoc*] inferior to the Popish Priests."—(*Mosheim's Eccles. Hist.: Murdock's Translation,* London, 1859, page 670.)

A. D. 1590.—Anthony Martin, a member of Queen Elizabeth's Court, called by Strype, "a man of good learning, and peaceable principles," wrote *modestly* in behalf of Episcopal government, with a design to reconcile all clergy and pastors of the Church to a perfect unity. Of him the Puritan Knollys says:

"In the first degree, he claimed for Bishops a superiority of government from God's own institution." But "if their superiority were first from God, then Bishops were not under-governors to her Majesty." "In short, this, in his opinion, was '*the highway to Popery!*'"—(*Strype's Whitgift,* fol., page 351.)

A. D. 1636.—A Puritan tract called "News from Ipswich," written by Prynne, and published this year, says of Diocesan Prelates:

"They are devils. 'Divell-Bishops.' And yet they will needs be Lord Bishops *jure divino*, by the Holy Ghost's own institution."

About the same time appeared another Puritan libel, entitled "A Looking-glass for Lordly Prelates." The writer of which says, in reference to their claim to Divine right and Apostolical Succession:

"They are so far from being sons or *Successors of Christ and his Apostles*, or of *Divine institution*, that they are of their father the Divell!"

The pious author then proceeds to draw a parallel between Bishops and Satan!

A. D. 1637.—Bastwick, Prynne, Burton, and Leighton, for writing books in which, with much scurrility, they "*denied the Divine right of Prelatical Episcopacy, and insisted on the equal official rank of all Christian pastors,*" as well as for sedition, were tried in the Star Chamber, condemned, and (very cruelly) punished.—(See *Neal's Puritans*, vol. ii.; also *Vaughan's History*, vol. i, page 472.)

"But the thing which the defendant desireth the Honorable Courts to take notice of, is the contumacy of the Prelates, for they call their hierarchy and the Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons *sacred*, which, if it bee graunted and bee so indeed, then the Prelats are *from God, and not from the King*, of whom they have no depence."—(*Bastwick's Answer.*)

A. D. 1662.—The Presbyterians offered to accept or submit to Episcopacy if it were declared to be a human institution or a matter of expediency. They were, of course, unable to gain their end; and in their "Memorial" to the King, they said [pages 13, 15,]:

"The Bishop for whom your Majesty here declareth, is *not Episcopus præses*, BUT EPISCOPUS PRINCEPS, *endued with the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction.*" "The Prelacy which we disclaim is that of Diocesans, *upon the claim of a superior Order to Presbyters*, assuming the *sole power of Ordination*," etc., etc.

A. D. 1664.—A Non-Conformist publication of this date called a "Christian and Sober Testimony," attempts to prove entire agreement between the English Church and that of Rome. Among other such things, it says:

"The Priests of Rome must first be Deacons ere they are Priests: so must the Priests of England." "The Priests of Rome must be ordained to their office by a Lord Bishop or his Suffragan, so must the Ministers of England."

Again, at page 28, the writer, referring to Church authorities, speaks of their "late practice whereby they have *declared the* NULLITY of *a Ministerial office received from the hands of a Presbyterie*, in *thrusting out of doors several hundreds of Ministers so ordained.*" The author of this very "*Christian* and *Sober* Testimony," says of Diocesan chief pastors:

"Their office is the neck of the Popish Hierarchie come out of the bottomless pit of hell!"

Thus far then, even from the acknowledgments or the bitter invectives of opponents, we prove that the Church's position has been well known and wholly unchanged. It will not be imagined that any change has taken place since 1662; therefore we might stop here. But it is as well to show from non-Episcopal witnesses of the present generation, that neither the Church of England, nor the American branch of it, has abandoned any principle, or wandered to the least extent from its original ground.

From "Apostolical Succession Examined" (pages 14–21, etc., etc.; London, 1834,) we take a sentence or two, which speak for themselves:

"The *Apostolical Succession* VAUNTED *by the English clergy*, has not the smallest intrinsic value." "*The English establishment* ENTIRELY EXCLUDES *from even an occasional use of its pulpits, all persons not ordained by a Prelate*, even such as may be well known to have been for years most useful pastors among English Dissenters, or in the established Kirk of Scotland, or in the Protestant Establishments of the Continent." "But as a contrast to the present exclusion of Protestants, it may surprise the reader to be informed, that if one of the Roman Catholic clergy should seek admission unto the Establishment as a Minister, the Bishop would not be required, *nor (it is believed) permitted to ordain him afresh*, since the touch of some Popish Prelate had already given him this dignified blessing of Apostolical Succession."

From "A Plea for Christian Communion," we learn page 83]:

"That not a single Protestant Church on the Continent of Europe is founded upon *the principles of ecclesiastical polity which* DISTINGUISH *the Church of England*. They are all, without exception, *constituted on principles which render them Dissenters* when any of their members, *whether Clergymen* or laymen, visit this country."

Again [page 86] the same writer says, it "ought never to be forgotten that there is not at this time any Protestant communion on earth *founded on the same* EXCLUSIVE PRINCIPLES *of Church polity* as those of the Church of England." He speaks also of the "groundless assumption" that "the Church of England is the true Church of Christ;" and adds, "IT IS CERTAIN *that upon this principle the compilers have framed all the parts, services, and offices of the Common Prayer and Liturgy.*" Expressly agreeing with the writer last quoted, he says, on page 98:

"Holy Orders, as they are called * * * are required to be obtained by every one who officiates in any the least public service. And no clergyman of any other Protestant communion on earth * * * * however venerable he may be for personal sanctity, profound in learning, and honored in his Ministry by the presence and blessing of God, would be permitted to enter the pulpit or desk in the Church of England in the character of a Minister of Jesus Christ!"

An essay on the "Moral and Spiritual Influence of the Church of England," published in London, 1834, says:

"The Church of England, in her present Protestant character, has existed about three hundred years." "She is a communion, making *high and* EXCLUSIVE *pretensions.*" "She seriously boasts of being the most venerable, the most Apostolical, and the purest Church in Christendom. Her Bishops are recognized, in their respective communities, as (with the exception of the [Roman] Catholic Prelates) the only genuine Successors of the Apostles. *Her Clergy, alone, are represented as truly reverend, and duly authorized and qualified to be efficient Ministers of the Gospel.*" "She looks with contempt on every other religious institution, and she treats the dissenting Minister as an incompetent intruder into Holy Orders, and his charge as a conventicle of unsaved and unsanctified fanatics."

Again [p. 279]:

"She treats all the Ministers of Christ, besides her own and the Roman Catholic Priesthood, as destitute of the qualifications and authority requisite for the VALID *discharge of pastoral duties.* She *recognizes no denomination as Christians, but her own; all besides are schismatics, heretics and unbelievers." "Her dogmas for subscription are of the like* EXCLUSIVE *and sectarian cast."*

It will not be wondered at, that this writer regards the "uncharitable" principles thus displayed, as a "reason *why the Redeemer withholds any great measure of success from her ministrations!*"

These works last quoted were issued by a society of English Dissenters, and so they have a much greater significance than if the writers were alone responsible for the assertions they maintain and the spirit they display. But with the latter we have, at present, nothing to do. Let us hear a witness of another kind.

About the year 1828, the Rev. J. S. Baker, Assistant Curate at Staines, near London, seceded from the Church, and published his reasons for so doing. Speaking of the "sectarian principles" of the Church he had left, he says:

"She holds no communion with any other Protestant Church. As one of her ministers, however much I might wish to admit into my pulpit a pious Presbyterian Minister of the established Church of Scotland, or a pious dissenting Minister of this country, I DARE NOT DO IT."

The amiable writer then goes on to say, that it would "rejoice his heart to see the Church of England give up this unscriptural principle."

From "An Essay on Apostolical Succession," by Thomas Powell, Wesleyan Minister, London, 1840, we take the following sentence:

"All attempts to make Ministers Lords over God's heritage is treason to the peace of the Church, and leads to Antichrist. *Episcopacy* by *divine right is such an attempt.* It is unscriptural, intolerant and anti-Christian. It sets up, as we have before said, ANGLICAN POPERY, with many heads, in place of ROMAN POPERY, with one."

This writer is very severe upon "the exclusive scheme of Episcopacy, *jure divino*," and the "figment of Episcopal Ordination and Succession."

Let us now come to this side of the Atlantic, and here we shall find the most prominent men in the Non-Episcopal Churches testifying to the consistency of ours.

The REV. DR. SAMUEL MILLER, of Princeton, wrote a great deal against our system. A single sentence, however, from his Letters on the Christian Ministry, will serve our present purpose:

You have seen that the Church of England, and those Churches which have immediately descended from her, stand *absolutely alone in the whole Protestant world, in representing Bishops* as an Order of Clergy superior to Presbyters; *all other Protestants—even those who adopt a sort of Prelacy—having pronounced it to be a mere human invention!*"

It will not be necessary to quote from the books of Dr. Wood, or Messrs. Smith & Shimeall, or the many others whose accusations contain the evidence we desire. Enough has already been given; but we will add one more testimony, viz., that of the venerable Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia. Speaking of Episcopalians, he says:

"According to their belief, the correct organization of the whole Church was dependent on the observance of the distinction between this 'superior grade' and an inferior grade in the Ministry, and there could be, in fact, no properly organized Church, unless there was an order of

men who should be properly 'the Successors of the Apostles.'" "The validity of all Ordinations everywhere, depended on this, and no one could be authorized to preach the Gospel, unless there had been laid on him the hands of those who were properly the 'Successors of the Apostles.'"—(*On the Apostolic Church*, pp. 59, 60.)

Again, speaking of the right of Non-Episcopal Churches "to be accredited as *true* Churches of the Lord Jesus, having a valid Ministry and valid Ordinances," he says:

"Is there any recognition of the Ministers of other denominations as having a right to preach the Gospel? *Is there any introduction* of them to the pulpits of Episcopal Churches? *Would such an introduction by any of the inferior Clergy be tolerated or connived at by the diocesan Bishop?* To ask these questions, is to answer them!"—(page 245.)

B.—TESTIMONY OR CONCESSIONS OF FOREIGN REFORMERS AND OTHER NON-EPISCOPALIANS.

MARTIN LUTHER.—We have elsewhere quoted the Augsburg Confession, in which Luther for himself and associates, professes that it was the cruelty, &c., of the Bishops [who were all Romish] that compelled them to do without the Episcopal Order, when they reformed the Church.

"If they would cease to persecute the Gospel, he and those of his communion would acknowledge them as their fathers, and willingly obey their authority, which we find supported by the Word of God."—(*Chandler's Appeal Defended*, page 239; *Bowden's Letters*, vol. ii. page 173.)

PHILIP MELANCTHON:

"I would to God it lay in me to restore the government of Bishops. For I see what manner of Church we shall have, the Ecclesiastical Polity being dissolved. I do see that hereafter will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church than ever was before."—(*Apolog. Augs. Confess.*, page 305; *Bowden*, vol. ii., 174.

"By what right or law may we dissolve the Ecclesiastical Polity if the Bishops will grant us that which in reason they ought to grant. And if it were lawful for us so to do, yet surely it were not expedient. LUTHER WAS EVER OF THIS OPINION."—(*History of Augs. Confess. Ibid.*)

PRINCE GEORGE OF ANHALT:

"I would to God those which bear the name of Bishops, would show themselves to be Bishops indeed. Oh, how willingly, and with what joy of heart would we receive them for our Bishops, reverence them, obey them, and yield to them their jurisdiction of Ordination which we always and Luther, both in words and in his writings very often hath professed." —(*Ibid.*)

JOHN CALVIN, in his letter to Cardinal Sadolet:

"If they [the Romanists] would exhibit to us such a hierarchy, wherein the Bishops shall so rule as that they refuse not to submit themselves to Christ, * * * then surely if there shall be any *who will not submit to this hierarchy, I confess that there is no kind of* ANATHEMA of which *they are not worthy.*"—(*Ibid.*)

In a letter to Cartwright, he uses similar language about the English Church:

"I had always a great reverence for the Bishops of your Church, to whom I gave inward reverence as well as outward respect, and would gladly have served them in settling of the English Church. And my judgment is, if we can have such a hierarchy in which the Bishops so excel others, that they refuse not subjection to Christ, but would depend upon Him as their only head, * * * in such a case I denounce him worthy of all curses who does not observe such a hierarchy with all reverence and obedience. AND I WOULD TO GOD SUCH A SUCCESSION HAD CONTINUED TO THIS DAY, *it should easily have obtained from us the obedience that it deserves.*"—(*Calder on Succession*, pp. 122, 123.)

The strongest proof that the sober judgment of the Genevan Reformer was not opposed to Episcopal polity as described in the New Testament, and as it existed in England, is found in the fact that he wrote a letter offering to accept it. That something of this kind had been proposed, appears to have been known, but the evidence of it was not full until the days of Archbishops Abbott and Usher. The former says:

"Perusing some papers of our predecessor, MATTHEW PARKER, we find that JOHN CALVIN, *and others of the Protestant Churches* of Germany and elsewhere, would have had Episcopacy, if permitted. And whereas John Calvin had sent a letter in King Edward VI.'s reign, to have conferred with the Clergy of England about some things to this effect *two* [*Popish*] *Bishops, Gardiner and Bonner, intercepted the same, whereby Mr. Calvin's overture perished.* And he received an answer as if it had been from the Reformed Divines of those times, wherein they checked him and slighted his proposals. From which time John Calvin and the Church of England

were at variance in several points, which otherwise, through God's mercy had been qualified, if those papers of his proposals had been discovered unto the Queen's Majesty, during John Calvin's life. But being not discovered until (or about) the sixth year of her Majesty's reign, her Majesty much lamented that they were not found sooner; which she expressed before her Council at the same time, in the presence of her great friends, Sir Henry Sidney and Sir William Cecil."—(*Strypes' Parker*, 8vo, Edit., vol. i. page 140.)

MARTIN BUCER, in his book De Regno Christi, writes to this effect:

"We see by the constant practice of the Church, even from the time of the Apostles, how it hath pleased the Holy Ghost, that among the ministers to whom the government of the Church is specially committed, one individual should have the chief management both of the Churches and of the whole ministry, and should in that management take precedence of all his brethren; for which reason the title of Bishop is employed to designate a chief spiritual governor."

"Bucer on all occasions expressed his anxiety that those Churches which enjoyed an Episcopal constitution should not, without sufficient reason, relinquish this advantage; nor obliterate by excessive change their resemblance to the Christian communities founded by the Apostles."—(*Sinclair on Episcopacy*, page 6.)

HENRY BULLINGER has been already quoted; but to show the concord of opinion among these Divines, we give another sentence or two from his pen. Speaking of the various propositions or heads of the puritan fabric, he says:

"That the civil magistrate has no authority in ecclesiastical matters, and * * * that the Church admits of no other government than that of Presbyters or the Presbytery, these two I say they hold in common with the Papists. * * * I wish there was no lust of dominion in the originators of this Presbytery! Nay, I think the greatest caution is necessary that the supreme power be not placed in this Presbytery, much more that it be not an exclusive government. Of the names and authority of Bishops, and also of the election of ministers, our friend Gaulter has fully written to the Reverend Lord Bishop of Ely, Master Cox, you may if you choose ask him for the letter."—(*Letter to Bishop Sandys; Zurich Letters*, vol. i., page 458.)

RODOLPH GUALTER, in the letter just mentioned, to which Bullinger referred Sandys, treats thus of the Episcopal office:

"I wonder that they entertain such an aversion to the name of Bishops, which they cannot but know was in use in the time of the Apostles, and always too retained in the Churches in after times; we know too that

Archbishops existed of old, whom they called by another name—*Patriarchs*. And if in later times they [i. e. Prelates] have occasioned so much offence by reason of their tyranny and ambition, that these titles are, not without reason, become odious to the Godly: I do not yet see what is to hinder that on the removal of the abuse, those persons may be Bishops, and called such, who, placed over a certain number of Churches, have the management of such things as appertain to the purity of religion and doctrine." * * * "What was done by Paul is well known, who, for this cause, left Titus in Crete, that he might ordain Elders and teachers in every city. The same Apostle too, commands that all things be done decently and in order, and I do not see how this can be the case without a certain distinction of ecclesiastical offices." * * * * "We also ourselves condemn that primacy which is connected with ambition and a desire of domination; but the Apostle has also taught us that there is a certain order among the ministers of the Church, when he says that some are appointed APOSTLES, some PROPHETS, and some PASTORS and TEACHERS; and as he makes a distinction of gifts and abilities, so does he also of administrations."—(*Letter to Bishop Cox; Zurich Letters*, v. i., pp. 442, 447.)

ZANCHY, in his well-known letter to Queen Elizabeth against the clerical vestments, says:

"Your Majesty should rather * * * employ all your consideration, authority and influence to this end, that you may have in the first place BISHOPS truly pious, and well instructed in sacred learning, as by the blessing of God you already possess very many. * * * The ELDERS in like manner, and DEACONS, are to be admonished that every one be diligent in his office. * * * FOR THESE THREE ORDERS OF MEN ARE THE NERVES OF THE CHURCH, UPON WHICH ITS SAFETY OR DOWNFALL DEPENDS."—(*Zurich Letters*, vol. i., 379.)

THEODORE BEZA, writing to Archbishop Whitgift, warmly eulogizes the Church polity of England:

"Let England enjoy by all means that special benefit of God, and God grant that it may be perpetual unto her." "If there be any who reject altogether Episcopal jurisdiction (a thing I can hardly be persuaded of), God forbid that any one in his senses should give way to the madness of such men."—(*Sinclair, as before*, page 7.)

ARCHBISHOP BANCROFT, in his Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline, quotes the following from Continental Divines of his own age, and that which preceded it—[*Bowden's Letters*, v. ii., pp. 176, 177]:

OSIANDER:—"Although in the primitive Church, when she flourished with miracles, there were *divers degrees and Orders of Ministers*, some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists and some Pastors and Doctors,

yet as now, the state of the Church is, the ministers may be divided into THREE ORDERS OR DEGREES, viz: DEACONS, PASTORS and SUPERINTENDENTS." HEMINGIUS:—"There are grades in the ministry, and that partly by the law of God, and partly by the approbation of the Church, * * * the purer Churches following the Apostles' times, ordained some Patriarchs, some Bishops, etc.—the Reformed Churches have their Bishops, Doctors, Pastors, etc." HOMBERGUS:—"God himself hath appointed degrees of Ministers in the Church."

After specifying the common duties of Bishops and Ministers, he sets down those which are *peculiar* to Bishops, viz., excommunication, confirmation, and ORDINATION. To the same purpose the Archbishop quotes HEERBRANDUS, JACOBUS, ANDREAS, HAYLBRONNER, and HUNIUS, who says: "That God doth require that there should be Orders and degrees of Ministers, *ut alii præsint alii subsint.*"

In the Book of Ecclesiastical Canons agreed upon by the Reformers of Poland and Hungary (A. D. 1623), the following oath of canonical obedience was required of every candidate for admission to Deacon's Orders:

"'I, ———, swear before the Living God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and before His Holy Angels, that I shall yield unto the Bishop, and Presbyters, all due obedience as unto my superiors. So help me God.' Another Canon recognizes the three Orders, and states the authority for them."—(*Sinclair on Episcopacy*, pages 7, 8.)

"Respecting the LUTHERAN CHURCHES of the North, throughout Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, we need here observe no more than that they adopted and acted upon the Episcopalian principles of the Augsburg Confession."—(*Ibid.*)

When Carleton, Davenant, and Hall, went to the Synod of Dort, they found there among the Dutch Reformed Divines, none who were *opposers* of Episcopacy, but many who voluntarily professed their regret at the loss of it. When Bishop Carleton spoke openly in the Synod of the Episcopal regimen, its authority, and its benefits, and showed how their troubles might be traced to the want of it, Bogerman, the President, replied, "*Domine. Nobis non licet esse tam beatis*—My Lord, we are not permitted to be so happy."—(*Bowden*, Vol. i., 219. *Bishop Hall*, Vol. ix.)

THE REMONSTRANTS did not differ from this judgment. Probably their greatest man was HUGO GROTIUS,

"The celebrated Lawyer and Statesman, the acute Metaphysician and Divine, well-known to all the Christian world, as an able defender of the Faith."

He thus sums up the argument between the Episcopalian writers and their adversaries, in his time:

"So light and foolish is what the latter have put forth in answer to the former, that to have read the one is to have already refuted the other; especially touching the Angels of the Churches, concerning whom, that which the Disturbers of Ecclesiastical Order bring, is so absurd and contrary to the sacred text itself, that it deserves not confutation." "The Bishop is of approved Divine right." "Those who think Episcopacy repugnant to God's will, must condemn the whole Primitive Church of folly and impiety."—(*Sinclair ut Supra*, p. 12.)

Again, in his "Annotations on the Consultation of Cassander" (Art. XIV.), he says:

"Bishops are the heads of the Presbyters; that pre-eminence was foreshown in Peter, appointed by the Apostles wherever it could be done, and approved by the Holy Ghost."—(*De Veritate, Le Clerc's Edition, Appendix*, p. 289.)

"Nor had he only a good opinion of the Church of England himself, but also advised his friends in Holland, who were of his party, * * * to take Holy Orders from our Bishops. * * * He addressed his brother in these words, 'I would persuade them (that is, the Remonstrants,) to appoint some among them to a more eminent station, such as Bishops; and that they receive the laying on of hands from the Irish Archbishop [Bramhall], who is there, and that when they are so ordained, they afterward ordain other pastors.'"—(*Testimonies attached to the De Veritate, ut Supra*, p. 310.)

When the Puritan party had full sway in England, they took, in 1643, as is well-known, their so called "Solemn League and Covenant," the second article of which pledged them, "without respect of persons, to endeavour the EXTIRPATION of Popery, Prelacy, that is Church Government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors," etc., etc. But this radical oath did not bind them against Apostolical Succession, for in 1647 they published their "Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici," in which the Divine right of a ministry is maintained, and the principle of Succession plainly avowed. They employed the learned Blondel to justify them in their course as Presbyterians, and his book has been the magazine for all writers against Episcopacy ever since:

"It closed with words to this purpose: 'By all that we have said to assert the rights to Presbytery, we do not intend to invalidate the ancient and Apostolical Constitution of Episcopal pre-eminence, but believe that wheresoever it is established conformably to the ancient canons, it must be carefully preserved; and, wheresoever, by some heat of contention or otherwise, it hath been put down, or violated, it ought to be reverently restored."

"This raised a great clamor, and the conclusion was suppressed. On the report getting about, John Blondel, then residing in London, wrote to his brother David, who acknowledged it was true."—(*See Du Moulin's Letter to Durell.—Bishop Horne.*)

JOHN LE CLERC, of Amsterdam, in his edition of "Grotius de Veritate," says:

"There are now two forms of government, one of which is that wherein the Church acts under one Bishop, who alone has the power of Ordaining Presbyters, * * the other is that where the Church is governed by an Equality of Presbyters. They who without prejudice have read over the most ancient Christian writers that now remain, know that the former manner of discipline, which is called Episcopal, * * prevailed everywhere in the age, immediately after the Apostles, whence we may collect that it is of Apostolical institution. The other, which they call Presbyterian, was instituted in many places of France, Switzerland, Germany, and Holland, by those who, in the 16th Century, made a separation from the Church of Rome. * * * *This latter form of Government was instituted* FOR THIS REASON ONLY, *that the Bishops would not allow to them who contended that the doctrine and manners of Christians stood in need of necessary amendment, that those things should be reformed, which they complained were corrupted."*—(*Clarke's Translation*, p. 272.)

DAILLE, a French Protestant Divine, author of the well-known work on the "Right Use of the Fathers," speaks plainly thus:

"Calvin himself honored all Bishops that were not subjects of the Pope, etc., such [Bishops] as were the Prelates of England. WE CONFESS THAT THE FOUNDATION OF THEIR CHARGE IS GOOD AND LAWFUL, ESTABLISHED BY THE APOSTLES, ACCORDING TO THE COMMAND OF CHRIST."—(*Bingham's French Church's Apology for the Church of England;* also, *How's Vindication*, p. 193.)

DE LE ANGLE, another Divine of the same Church, in a letter to Dr. Brevint, uses the following strong language:

"I cannot tell what these haters of the peace of the Church mean, that prattle up and down as if the French Churches were great adversaries of the Episcopal Order. God forbid, Sir, that we should have such a perverse and rash opinion. I am sure that neither Monsieur

Daille, nor Monsieur Amiraut, nor Monsieur Bochart, nor any of my colleagues of Rouen ever approved of it."—(*How*, p. 199.)

P. Du Moulin, in his memorable correspondence with Bishop Andrews (to which we have referred elsewhere), confessed that he was withheld from publicly testifying in favor of Episcopacy, by two considerations. The first was that he would then utterly condemn his own Church and Congregation, excluding them from hope of salvation. Andrews assured him that in this respect he was greatly mistaken, as the defenders of Episcopacy were not in the habit of anathematizing others, nor in any way required to "*damn*" any individual [see page 342]. Du Moulin's second objection was, that if among those who had rejected Episcopacy, he should defend it as of divine right, he would be driven away or starved. To this we know not what reply could be made.

Du Bosc, Casaubon, and others have also declared their regard for Episcopacy, and their belief in its divine authority.

Lectius, of Geneva, says:

"We maintain that those are true and lawful Bishops whom St. Paul describes in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and we do not deny that there were such formerly in that great kingdom of Great Britain, and that at this day there are such Bishop's there."—(*Durell's View of For. Ref. Churches*, pp. 169–170; *How's Vindication*, 194.)

We come now to Britain. There we find that the leaders of the various Schismatic movements learned the error of their ways, and returned to the Church they had so deeply injured.

Robert Browne, the founder of the Brownists or Congregationalists, was one of these; he conformed many years before his death, and, in consequence, he is now painted in very dark colors by the descendants of those whom he led astray. As a separatist, Browne was, of course, a saint; but as soon as he gave up his schism and sought forgiveness and peace in the Church, he became (*if they are to believed*) a very reprobate, drunken, immoral, &c., &c.

Even Thomas Cartwright, the Coryphæus of Puritanism, returned to the mother he had deserted and opposed. He acknowledged the great kindness of Archbishop Whitgift, notwithstanding all the provocation he had given him, and he served the Church in quietness and contentment till his death.

"He seriously lamented the unnecessary troubles he had caused in the Church by the schism he had been the great fomenter of, and wished he was to begin his life again, that he might testify to the world the dislike he had of his former ways. And in this opinion he died."—(*Strype's Whitgift*, Fol., p. 554.)

We have seen elsewhere, that several prominent Puritans of the age of Cromwell and Charles II., were reconciled to the Church. One or two even became Bishops, while others, who never worked regularly as Church Clergymen, *received Episcopal Ordination*, "TO MAKE ALL SURE." Such were Manton, and Richard Baxter.

JOHN WESLEY ought never to be classed with the wilful dividers of the Church, for, notwithstanding some inconsistencies, he was, all through his long life, a lover of the Church, a firm believer in its divine authority, and a plain asserter of the sinfulness of Schism. Yet, as his followers have unfortunately placed themselves among Presbyterian bodies, he, as the founder of the Society or Denomination, is popularly judged as having approved of the course which they pursued. This error must be corrected. As to Ordination, he says:

"We *account it of divine institution*, and *that by it a ministerial commission is conveyed.*"

When asked by what authority he exercised his Ministry, he replied:

"*By the authority of* JESUS CHRIST, *conveyed to me by the (now) Archbishop of Canterbury, when he laid his hands upon me and said, 'Take thou authority,' &c., &c.*"

When it was said that, at least in case of necessity, Baptism might be performed by women, or Jews, Wesley answered:

"No! Our Lord gave this commission only to the Apostles, and to their Successors in the Ministry."

In his sermon on the "Catholic Spirit," he says:

"I believe the Episcopal form of Church Government to be Scriptural and Apostolical."

And, in 1789, in the 87th year of his age, he closes a most important letter with these words:

"I declare, once more, that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice, will ever seperate from it.—JOHN WESLEY."—(*Bishop Henshaw.*)

CHARLES WESLEY never faltered in his allegiance to the Church. When his brother was persuaded, in his old age, by Coke and others, to set up for a Bishop (*sine consecratione*), and even to assume a power which no single Bishop could canonically claim, the whole matter was kept carefully concealed from Charles until the evil step had been taken, and then his remonstrances were full and decisive. We have not room for more than a word or two of what he wrote upon the subject:

"I can scarcely yet believe it, that, in his 82d year, my brother, my old intimate friend and companion, should have assumed the Episcopal character — ordained Elders, consecrated a Bishop, and sent him over to ordain our lay preachers in America. I was then in Bristol, at his elbow — yet he never gave me the least hint of his intention. How was he surprised into so rash an action? He certainly persuaded himself that it was right. Lord Mansfield told me, last year, that Ordination was Seperation This my brother does not and will not see; nor that he has renounced the principles and practices of his whole life; that he has acted contrary to all his declarations, protestations and writings; robbed his friends of their boastings, realized the Nag's Head Ordination, and left an indelible blot on his name, as long as it shall be remembered."*

It is a comfort to know that the venerable Patriarch learned to regret his course, and even reprimanded the quasi "Bishops" of the American Methodist Society, for assuming that name.

JOHN WHITEHEAD, M. D., was a prominent preacher of the Methodist Society, and one of Mr. Wesley's intimate friends. The latter appointed him, in conjunction with Dr. Coke and Henry Moore, his Literary Executor. In his Lives of the Wesleys [which the Methodist Conference has always discountenanced, and endeavored to suppress], he bears the testimony of an honest man to the original Constitution of the Society, and condemns, unhestatingly, the course which Coke and others caused its venerable founder to adopt. He says that, from reading Lord King's Enquiry, Wesley had accepted the theory advocated by him [and by Mr. Goode], that *the Bishop differs from the Presbyter only in degree, not in Order;* but the act of

* Charles Wesley's pungent lines are too good to be omitted:

"So easily are Bishops made,
By man or woman's whim;
Wesley his hands on Coke has laid,
But who laid hands on him?"

Ordaining implies superior right or superior authority, while, as regards Coke, who was himself a Presbyter, Wesley had neither.

"His Episcopal authority was a mere gratuitous assumption of power to himself, contrary to the usage of every Church, ancient or modern, where the Order of Bishop has been admitted. There is no precedent, either in the New Testament or in Church history, that can justify his proceeding in this affair. And as Mr. Wesley had received no right to exercise Episcopal authority, either from any Bishop, Presbyter or people, he certainly could not convey any right to others. HIS ORDINATIONS, THEREFORE, ARE SPURIOUS AND OF NO VALIDITY."

"But I willingly quit a subject which is very unpleasant and most sincerely wish that both the practice of ordaining, among the Methodists, and the memory of it, were buried in oblivion; and were the practice, which, in my view of it, is pregnant with mischief, totally to cease, never to be revived, I would tear the memory of it from these pages as soon as they are printed."—(*Life of Wesley*, Amer. Ed., 1845, pp. 532–533.)

DR. ADAM CLARKE was by far the greatest scholar that the Methodists have ever had among them, and one of the most learned and excellent men of Christendom, in his generation. In his Commentary, he repeatedly affirms the divine institution of Episcopacy. For instance:

"Deacon, Presbyter and Bishop existed in the Apostolic Church, and may, therefore, be considered of divine origin."

In other writings he distinctly disclaimed any intention or desire to invade the proper ministerial office. He describes himself as simply *a Preacher* "without Holy Orders, without *pretended* Holy Orders, and without pretensions to Holy Orders." After this the reader will hardly require to be informed that Dr. Clarke's works are not regarded as standards by the body to which he brought so much honor. The conservative man is never in favor with the radical.

C.—APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.

We have already pointed out the two different senses in which the word Succession has been employed by theologians. (1) A Succession of Bishops in one Diocese—i. e. the Succession of persons in places. (2) A transmission of Ministerial or Episcopal authority in regular order from one generation to another.

The distinction between these can be made more evident by illustration. Let us take the Archdiocese of Canterbury since the Reformation. Its Succession has been as follows: 1, CRANMER; 2, Pole [Romanist]; 3, Parker; 4, Grindal; 5, Whitgift; 6, Bancroft; 7, Abbott; 8, Laud; 9, Juxon; 10, Sheldon; 11, Sancroft; 12, Tillotson; 13, Tenison; 14, Wake; 15, Potter; 16, Herring; 17, Hutton; 18, Secker; 19, Cornwallis; 20, Moore; 21, Sutton; 22, Howley; 23, Sumner; 24, Longley.

This table shows that the present Metropolitan succeeds in his place or office the martyr Cranmer. But it tells no more.

Let us now trace the descent of the Episcopal commission from Cranmer:

Archbishop Thomas Cranmer consecrated Robert Parfew,

Robert Parfew	consecrated	John Hodskins,
John Hodskins	"	Matthew Parker,
Matthew Parker	"	Edmund Grindal,
Edmund Grindal	"	John Whitgift,
John Whitgift	"	Richard Bancroft,
Richard Bancroft	"	George Abbott,
George Abbott	"	George Monteigne,
George Monteigne	"	William Laud,
William Laud	"	Matthew Wren,
Matthew Wren	"	Gilbert Sheldon,
Gilbert Sheldon	"	Henry Compton,
Henry Compton	"	William Sancroft,
William Sancroft	"	Jonathan Trelawney,
Jonat. Trelawney	"	John Potter,
John Potter	"	Thomas Herring,
Thomas Herring	"	Frederick Cornwallis,
Fred. Cornwallis	"	John Moore,

John Moore	consecrated	Charles M. Sutton,
Chas. M. Sutton	"	William Howley,
William Howley	"	Christopher Bethell,
Chris. Bethell	"	John Bird Sumner,
J. Bird Sumner	"	Charles T. Longley.

This list shows that the present Archbishop has been validly consecrated to his high office in direct Succession from the first Protestant incumbent of it.

The former is a list of the EPISCOPAL SUCCESSION in the Province of Canterbury. The latter is a list tracing the APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION from Archbishop Cranmer to Archbishop Longley.

The former is of comparatively little importance. It is not a note of the Church, because it cannot be found everywhere. For instance, within this year we have in our American Church three of four Bishops ordained to exercise jurisdiction where there has been but one predecessor. The Succession in Nebraska begins with Bishop Talbot. He *had no Succession to point to.* Now *this* is the "Succession" of which several English divines have spoken in an indifferent or disparaging manner. And when Mr. Goode or Mr. Gallagher quotes such passages, they quote what they *ought* to know has no bearing upon that specially styled "APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION." For instance, Jewel says:

"Have these men their own Succession in so safe record? Who was then the Bishop of Rome next by Succession unto Peter? Who was the second? Who the third? Who the fourth? Irenæus reckoneth them together in this order: Petrus, Linus, Anacletus, Clemens. Epiphanius thus: Petrus, Linus, Cletus, Clemens. Optatus thus: Petrus, Linus, Clemens, Anacletus. Clemens saith that he himself was next unto Peter. * * * Hereby it is clear that of the four first Bishops of Rome M. Harding cannot certainly tell us who in order succeeded others. And thus talking so much of Succession, they are not well able to blaze their own Succession."—(*Defence of Apology*, page 326.)

"Because we will grant somewhat to Succession, tell us hath the Pope alone succeeded Peter; and wherein, I pray you?"

"We have departed from him to whom we were not bound, and who had nothing to lay for himself, but only I know not what virtue or power of *the place where he dwelleth*, and *a continuance of Succession.*"—(*Apology.*)

In the same spirit, Pilkington says;

"If succeeding in place be sufficient to prove them good Bishops, then

the Jews and Turks have their good Bishops and religion still at Jerusalem, Constantinople, and elsewhere, for there they dwell where the Apostles did; and have their synagogues, Bishops, Priests, and Levites after their sort." "Succession of good Bishops is a great grace of God; but because God and his truth hangs not on man nor place, we rather hang on the undeceivable truth of God's Word, in all doubts, than on any Bishops, place, or man."

Dean Field writes in the same strain, and Archbishop Laud also, as we have seen already. The latter says:

"For Succession in the general, I shall say this: It is a great happiness where it may be had 'visible' and 'continued' * * but I do not find any one of the ancient fathers that makes *local*, personal, visible, and continued Succession a necessary sign or mark of the true Church anywhere."

Such a Succession is, indeed, of comparatively little value. But Pilkington points out the true one where, he says:

"*A Succession of Bishops or Ministers we grant has been in the world, rather than in any one See or Country,* WHICH SUCCESSION *we say* WE HAVE, AND FOLLOW BETTER THAN THEY."

This is the "Apostolical Succession" of which we have treated throughout this work, and to oppose which, we find partisan writers citing passages which refer not to continuance of Order or transmission of authority, but to "personal and local Succession" only.

We have elsewhere stated that non-Episcopal bodies hold the doctrine, differing from us only as to the line in which the Succession is to be traced. Proof of this has been furnished, but much more can be given. For instance, the Presbyterian work "Jus Divinum," etc., says:

"This government in the Church is *jure divino;* for of those governments, as well as of Apostles, Prophets, and teachers, it is said God hath set them in the Church. * * * Now if they have been set in the Church, and God hath set them there, here is a plain *jus divinum* for government in the Church." "What was said to the Apostles touching preaching and baptizing, remitting and retaining sins, was said to all the APOSTLES' SUCCESSORS to the end of the world."

"The substance of true Ordination remaining at that time in the Church of Rome, cannot be annulled and evacuated by those human corruptions that were annexed or superadded thereto, no more than the Baptism of the Church of Rome is to be accounted null and void, there being the same ground for the one as for the other. Schism, heresy, and

scandal in the Church of Corinth did not destroy that Church; nor do superstitious additionals or mixtures with ordinations in the Church of Rome destroy Ordination itself."—(*Jus Divinum and its Appendix, as quoted by Bishop Henshaw.*)

The same general doctrine is avowed by Dr. Doddridge, by Thomas Boston, and other such Divines.

The work of Dr. Lathrop, a Congregationalist, on Apostolical Succession, is well known, having been reprinted and edited by the late Bishop Wainwright. But DR. HOPKINS, (the founder of Hopkinsianism,) a far more prominent Congregationalist, has spoken out in as clear a tone:

"It is said, if the Church have no authority or right to constitute or ordain their own officers, then there must be an UNINTERRUPTED SUCCESSION of Ministers from the Apostles to the end of the world; and if this chain of Succession be once broken it cannot be renewed again, but the Succession must necessarily cease, and then there can be no Ministers and officers in the Church to the end of the world. To this it may be answered, that if this be an appointment of Jesus Christ * * that his Church shall be furnished with Ministers by such a Succession from one to another, then He will take care that it shall never be interrupted," etc., etc.

"But to this it has been said that we have no evidence that such Succession has not in fact been interrupted many times; and not one Minister or Elder at this day can prove or have any evidence himself that he has been ordained by one or more, who have received this right and power to ordain by an uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles. * * * Besides, if this Succession could be proved, it must be brought down through the hands of the Pope and the false Anti-Christian Church, * * which necessarily interrupts the Succession."

"Upon this, the following things are to be observed: 1, If there be evidence from Scripture that such an Order and Succession of men * * has been established by Christ, and is implied in the commission which he gave to his disciples: '*Go ye and teach all nations*,' etc., etc.; '*and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*'" "This IS SUFFICIENT, POSITIVE PROOF *that such a Succession of Ministers does in fact take place* in the visible Church of Christ; and *that this commission has been transmitted from one to another from that time to this day; and that this Succession has not been* interrupted, and will not be to the end of the world."

If our space would admit of it, we would add to this the no less emphatic testimony of the celebrated Dr. J. M. Mason, of New York.

D.—"THE SIN OF QUOTATION."

IT was our intention to have given, under this head, an *exposé* of the manner in which some opponents of Apostolical Succession conduct their share of the controversy; but we cannot afford space for more than a few words. Some of the parties referred to sin wilfully. Others follow them without intending to deceive, and thus untruth is propagated, little as the agents may suppose it. The only way in which this evil can be prevented, is by avoiding the system of *general* or loose quotation, and that which the "Episcopal Recorder" calls "parrot-like repetitions." Take one or two examples. Dr. Canfield copies from some previous writer what purports to be a quotation from Strype. He does not indicate the work, the book, chapter or page, but gives the paragraph with inverted commas. We have been at some pains to search for it in the place where such a passage might be found. It is not there; but something of a different character is. Mr. Gallagher mentions "Mason's Vindiciæ" as a work of special importance, and professes to quote a portion of it, which appears very favorable to his cause. He gives the very page from which he has taken it. *We turn to that page and* THERE IS NO SUCH PASSAGE THERE. We knew there was not, before we looked, as any one might have done who had any knowledge of the subject. In this, we believe, the Reverend gentleman did not intend to misrepresent Mason. He only made his quotation from a work which, in all probability, he never saw.

THE END.

JAN 311894

C 6128.52.7

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Harvard College Library

FROM

JOHN HARVEY TREAT,

OF LAWRENCE, MASS.

(Class of 1862).

Received April 25, 1888.